

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to require ride-hailing companies to implement an enhanced digital system to verify passengers with their authorized ride-hailing vehicles and drivers.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME ON H.R. 7575, WATER RE- SOURCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7575 be extended to 1 hour at the request of the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7575) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7575

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Development Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Budgetary treatment expansion and adjustment for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Sec. 102. Funding for navigation.

Sec. 103. Annual report to Congress on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Sec. 104. Additional measures at donor ports and energy transfer ports.

Sec. 105. Assumption of maintenance of a locally preferred plan.

Sec. 106. Coast Guard anchorages.

Sec. 107. State contribution of funds for certain operation and maintenance costs.

Sec. 108. Inland waterway projects.

Sec. 109. Implementation of water resources principles and requirements.

Sec. 110. Resiliency planning assistance.

Sec. 111. Project consultation.

Sec. 112. Review of resiliency assessments.

Sec. 113. Small flood control projects.

Sec. 114. Conforming amendment.

Sec. 115. Feasibility studies; review of natural and nature-based features.

Sec. 116. Report on corrosion prevention activities.

Sec. 117. Quantification of benefits for flood risk management projects in seismic zones.

Sec. 118. Federal interest determination.

Sec. 119. Economically disadvantaged community flood protection and hurricane and storm damage reduction study pilot program.

Sec. 120. Permanent measures to reduce emergency flood fighting needs for communities subject to repetitive flooding.

Sec. 121. Emergency response to natural disasters.

Sec. 122. Study on natural infrastructure at Corps of Engineers projects.

Sec. 123. Review of Corps of Engineers assets.

Sec. 124. Sense of Congress on multipurpose projects.

Sec. 125. Beneficial reuse of dredged material; dredged material management plans.

Sec. 126. Aquatic ecosystem restoration for anadromous fish.

Sec. 127. Annual report to Congress.

Sec. 128. Harmful algal bloom demonstration program.

Sec. 129. Update on Invasive Species Policy Guidance.

Sec. 130. Report on debris removal.

Sec. 131. Missouri River interception-rearing complex construction.

Sec. 132. Cost and benefit feasibility assessment.

Sec. 133. Materials, services, and funds for repair, restoration, or rehabilitation of projects.

Sec. 134. Levee safety.

Sec. 135. National Dam Safety Program.

Sec. 136. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed pump stations.

Sec. 137. Non-Federal Project Implementation Pilot Program.

Sec. 138. Definition of economically disadvantaged community.

Sec. 139. Cost sharing provisions for territories and Indian Tribes.

Sec. 140. Flood control and other purposes.

Sec. 141. Review of contracting policies.

Sec. 142. Buy America.

Sec. 143. Annual report on status of feasibility studies.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Sec. 201. Authorization of proposed feasibility studies.

Sec. 202. Expedited completions.

Sec. 203. Feasibility study modifications.

Sec. 204. Selma, Alabama.

Sec. 205. Comprehensive study of the Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, California.

Sec. 206. Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule, Florida.

Sec. 207. Great Lakes Coastal Resiliency Study.

Sec. 208. Rathbun Lake, Chariton River, Iowa.

Sec. 209. Report on the status of restoration in the Louisiana coastal area.

Sec. 210. Lower Mississippi River comprehensive study.

Sec. 211. Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan.

Sec. 212. Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri.

Sec. 213. Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River and Rye Harbor, New Hampshire.

Sec. 214. Cougar and Detroit Dams, Willamette River Basin, Oregon.

Sec. 215. Port Orford, Oregon.

Sec. 216. Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek, Fairview, Texas.

Sec. 217. GAO study on mitigation for water resources development projects.

Sec. 218. GAO study on application of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund expenditures.

Sec. 219. GAO study on administration of environmental banks.

Sec. 220. Study on Corps of Engineers concessionaire agreements.

Sec. 221. Study on water supply and water conservation at water resources development projects.

Sec. 222. PFAS review and inventory at Corps facilities.

Sec. 223. Report on recreational facilities.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

Sec. 301. Deauthorization of inactive projects.

Sec. 302. Abandoned and inactive noncoal mine restoration.

Sec. 303. Tribal partnership program.

Sec. 304. Lakes program.

Sec. 305. Watercraft inspection stations.

Sec. 306. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed dams.

Sec. 307. Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program.

Sec. 308. Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.

Sec. 309. McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.

Sec. 310. Ouachita-Black River Navigation Project, Arkansas.

Sec. 311. Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa, California.

Sec. 312. Lake Isabella, California.

Sec. 313. Lower San Joaquin River flood control project.

Sec. 314. San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego County, California.

Sec. 315. San Francisco, California, Waterfront Area.

Sec. 316. Western Pacific Interceptor Canal, Sacramento River, California.

Sec. 317. Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

Sec. 318. New London Harbor Waterfront Channel, Connecticut.

Sec. 319. Washington Harbor, District of Columbia.

Sec. 320. Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida.

Sec. 321. Central Everglades, Florida.

Sec. 322. Miami River, Florida.

Sec. 323. Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida.

Sec. 324. Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L-73 (Section 1), Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida.

Sec. 325. Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.

Sec. 326. San Juan-Chama project; Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico.

Sec. 327. Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Sec. 328. Harris County, Texas.

Sec. 329. Cap Sante Waterway, Washington.

Sec. 330. Regional sediment management.

Sec. 331. Additional assistance for critical projects.

Sec. 332. Project modification authorizations.

Sec. 333. Application of credit.

Sec. 334. Project reauthorizations.

Sec. 335. Conveyances.

Sec. 336. Repeals.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

Sec. 401. Project authorizations.

Sec. 402. Special rules.

Sec. 403. Authorization of projects based on feasibility studies prepared by non-Federal interests.

TITLE V—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Sec. 501. Determination of Budgetary Effects.

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS**SEC. 101. BUDGETARY TREATMENT EXPANSION AND ADJUSTMENT FOR THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14003 of division B of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 14003. Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) HARBOR MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for the Construction, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts of the Corps of Engineers are enacted that are derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established under section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that the Congress designates in statute as being for harbor operations and maintenance activities, then the adjustment for that fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations that are derived from such Fund and designated as being for harbor operations and maintenance activities.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 102. FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION.

(a) FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended, in the section heading, by striking “AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS” and inserting “FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION”.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HARBOR PROJECTS.—Section 210(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, of the funds made available under this section (including funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund), the Secretary shall make expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of the harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2), using—

“(A) not less than 20 percent of such funds for emerging harbor projects, to the extent there are identifiable operations and maintenance needs, including eligible breakwater and jetty needs, at such harbor projects;

“(B) not less than 12 percent of such funds for projects that are located within the Great Lakes Navigation System;

“(C) 10 percent of such funds for expanded uses carried out at donor ports, as such term is defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c); and

“(D) any remaining funds for operation and maintenance costs of any harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) based on an equitable allocation of such funds among such harbors and inland harbors.”;

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) ADDITIONAL USES AT EMERGING HARBORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than \$5,000,000 of funds designated for emerging harbor projects under paragraph (1)(A) to pay for the costs of up to 10 projects for maintenance dredging of a marina or berthing area, in an emerging harbor, that includes an area that is located adjacent to, or is accessible by, a Federal navigation project, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EMERGING HARBORS.—The Secretary may use funds as authorized under

subparagraph (A) at an emerging harbor that—

“(i) supports commercial activities, including commercial fishing operations, commercial fish processing operations, recreational and sport fishing, and commercial boat yards; or

“(ii) supports activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

“(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall require a non-Federal interest to contribute not less than 25 percent of the costs for maintenance dredging of that portion of a maintenance dredging project described in subparagraph (A) that is located outside of the Federal navigation project, which may be provided as an in-kind contribution, including through the use of dredge equipment owned by non-Federal interest to carry out such activities.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary from making an expenditure to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of a specific harbor or inland harbor, including the transfer of funding from the operation and maintenance of a separate project, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the action is necessary to address the navigation needs of a harbor or inland harbor where safe navigation has been severely restricted due to an unforeseen event; and

“(B) the Secretary provides within 90 days of the action notice and information on the need for the action to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

(c) PRIORITIZATION.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF HARBORS AND INLAND HARBORS.—Section 210(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “expanded uses at eligible harbors or inland harbors referred to in subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “uses described in paragraphs (1)(C) and (3) of subsection (c)”.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Section 210(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (6) through (9);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) EMERGING HARBOR.—The term ‘emerging harbor’ means a harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) that transmits less than 1,000,000 tons of cargo annually.

“(3) EMERGING HARBOR PROJECT.—The term ‘emerging harbor project’ means a project that is assigned to an emerging harbor.”; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) An in-water improvement, if the improvement—

“(i) is for the seismic reinforcement of a wharf or other berthing structure, or the repair or replacement of a deteriorating wharf or other berthing structure, at a port facility;

“(ii) benefits commercial navigation at the harbor; and

“(iii) is located in, or adjacent to, a berth that is accessible to a Federal navigation project.

“(D) An activity to maintain slope stability at a berth in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal navigation project if such activity benefits commercial navigation at the harbor.”.

SEC. 103. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

Section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (26 U.S.C. 9505 note; 106 Stat. 4851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “and annually thereafter,” and inserting “and annually thereafter concurrent with the submission of the President’s annual budget request to Congress,”; and

(B) by striking “Public Works and Transportation” and inserting “Transportation and Infrastructure”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A description of the expected expenditures from the trust fund to meet the needs of navigation for the fiscal year of the budget request.”.

SEC. 104. ADDITIONAL MEASURES AT DONOR PORTS AND ENERGY TRANSFER PORTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2106(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) at which the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes collected (including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers) comprise not less than \$15,000,000 annually of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal years;”;

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting “(including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking “fiscal year 2012” each place it appears and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9) and inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.—The term ‘Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund’ means the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established by section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”; and

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) at which the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes collected (including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers) comprise annually more than \$5,000,000 but less than \$15,000,000 of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal years;”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2020” and inserting “2030”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 105. ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN.

Section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—

“(1) ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE.—Whenever a non-Federal interest carries out improvements to a federally authorized harbor or inland harbor, the Secretary shall be responsible for operation and maintenance in accordance with section 101(b) if—

“(A) before construction of the improvements—

“(i) the Secretary determines that the improvements are feasible and consistent with the purposes of this title; and

“(ii) the Secretary and the non-Federal interest execute a written agreement relating to operation and maintenance of the improvements;

“(B) the Secretary certifies that the project or separable element of the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards; and

“(C) the Secretary does not find that the project or separable element is no longer feasible.

“(2) FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IN THE COSTS OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN.—In the case of improvements determined by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(i) to deviate from the national economic development plan, the Secretary shall be responsible for all operation and maintenance costs of such improvements, as described in section 101(b), including costs in excess of the costs of the national economic development plan, if the Secretary determines that the improvements satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1).”

SEC. 106. COAST GUARD ANCHORAGES.

The Secretary is authorized to perform dredging at Federal expense within and adjacent to anchorages on the Columbia River established by the Coast Guard pursuant to section 7 of the Act of March 14, 1915 (33 U.S.C. 471), to provide safe anchorage for deep draft vessels commensurate with the authorized Federal navigation channel depth, including advanced maintenance.

SEC. 107. STATE CONTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.

In carrying out eligible operations and maintenance activities within the Great Lakes Navigation System pursuant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) in a State that has implemented any additional State limitation on the disposal of dredged material in the open waters of such State, the Secretary may, pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), receive from such State, and expend, such funds as may be contributed by the State to cover the additional costs for operations and maintenance activities for a harbor or inland harbor within such State that result from such limitation.

SEC. 108. INLAND WATERWAY PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212), 35 percent of the costs of construction of any project for navigation on the inland waterways shall be paid from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund—

(1) during each of fiscal years 2021 through 2027; and

(2) for a project the construction of which is initiated during such period, in each fiscal year until such construction is complete.

(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In selecting projects described in subsection (a) for which to initiate construction during any of fiscal years

2021 through 2027, the Secretary shall prioritize projects that are included in the most recent 20-year program for making capital investments developed under section 302(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251(d)).

SEC. 109. IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue final agency-specific procedures necessary to implement the principles and requirements and the interagency guidelines.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The procedures required by subsection (a) shall ensure that the Secretary, in the formulation of future water resources development projects—

(1) develops such projects in accordance with—

(A) the guiding principles established by the principles and requirements; and

(B) the national water resources planning policy established by section 2031(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3(a)); and

(2) fully identifies and analyzes national economic development benefits, regional economic development benefits, environmental quality benefits, and other societal effects.

(c) REVIEW AND UPDATE.—Every 5 years, the Secretary shall review and, where appropriate, revise the procedures required by subsection (a).

(d) PUBLIC REVIEW, NOTICE, AND COMMENT.—In issuing, reviewing, and revising the procedures required by this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide notice to interested non-Federal stakeholders of the Secretary's intent to revise the procedures;

(2) provide opportunities for interested non-Federal stakeholders to engage with, and provide input and recommendations to, the Secretary on the revision of the procedures; and

(3) solicit and consider public and expert comments.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INTERAGENCY GUIDELINES.—The term “interagency guidelines” means the interagency guidelines contained in the document finalized by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3) in December 2014, to implement the principles and requirements.

(2) PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS.—The term “principles and requirements” means the principles and requirements contained in the document prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3), entitled “Principles and Requirements for Federal Investments in Water Resources”, and dated March 2013.

SEC. 110. RESILIENCY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 206(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(a)) is amended by inserting “, to avoid repetitive flooding impacts, to anticipate, prepare, and adapt to changing climatic conditions and extreme weather events, and to withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruption due to the flood hazards” after “in planning to ameliorate the flood hazard”.

(b) PRIORITIZING FLOOD RISK RESILIENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), the Secretary shall prioritize the provision of technical assist-

ance to support flood risk resiliency planning efforts of an economically disadvantaged community.

SEC. 111. PROJECT CONSULTATION.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the following reports:

(1) The report required under section 1214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3809).

(2) The report required under section 1120(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1643).

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) AGENCIES AND TRIBES.—The Secretary shall ensure that all covered community consultation policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers continue to be implemented, and that consultations with Federal and State agencies and Indian Tribes required for a water resources development project are carried out.

(2) COMMUNITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that any covered communities, including such communities identified in the reports submitted under subsection (a), that are found to be disproportionately or adversely affected are included in consultation policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers.

(3) PROJECT PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that covered communities are consulted in the development of water resources development project planning and construction, for the purposes of achieving environmental justice and addressing any disproportionate or adverse effects on such communities.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update any policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers related to achieving environmental justice for covered communities.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with a wide array of representatives of covered communities; and

(B) use the recommendations from the reports submitted under subsection (a).

(d) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects in, and all other activities of the Corps of Engineers related to, covered communities, the Corps of Engineers—

(1) promotes the meaningful involvement of such communities in the project development and implementation, enforcement efforts, and other activities of the Corps of Engineers;

(2) provides guidance and technical assistance to such communities to increase understanding of the project development and implementation activities, regulations, and policies of the Corps of Engineers; and

(3) cooperates with State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to activities carried out pursuant to this subsection.

(e) TRIBAL LANDS AND CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects and in all other activities of the Corps of Engineers, that the Corps of Engineers—

(1)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal lands near or adjacent to any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands of ancestral, cultural, or religious importance; and

(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such lands; and

(2)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal areas near or adjacent to

any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands, waters, and other resources critical to the livelihood of the Indian Tribes; and

(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such areas.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMUNITY OF COLOR.**—The term “community of color” means a community of individuals who are—

- (A) American Indian or Alaska Native;
- (B) Asian or Pacific Islander;
- (C) Black, not of Hispanic origin; or
- (D) Hispanic.

(2) **COVERED COMMUNITY.**—The term “covered community” means each of the following:

- (A) A community of color.
- (B) An economically disadvantaged community.
- (C) A rural community.
- (D) A Tribal or indigenous community.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 112. REVIEW OF RESILIENCY ASSESSMENTS.

(a) **RESILIENCY ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and in conjunction with the development of procedures under section 109 of this Act, the Secretary is directed to review, and where appropriate, revise the existing planning guidance documents and regulations on the assessment of the effects of sea level rise on future water resources development projects to ensure that such guidance documents and regulations are based on the best available, peer-reviewed science and data on the current and future effects of sea level rise on coastal communities.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate the review with the Engineer Research and Development Center, other Federal and State agencies, and other relevant entities; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize data provided to the Secretary by such agencies.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF BENEFITS OF SEA LEVEL RISE RESILIENCY IN FEASIBILITY REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of a non-Federal interest, in carrying out a feasibility study for a project for flood risk mitigation, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), the Secretary shall consider whether the need for the project is predicated upon or exacerbated by conditions related to sea level rise.

(2) **SEA LEVEL RISE RESILIENCY BENEFITS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out a study pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall document the potential effects of sea level rise on the project, and benefits of the project relating to sea level rise, during the 50-year period after the date of completion of the project.

SEC. 113. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended by inserting “, and projects that use natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))),” after “nonstructural projects”.

SEC. 114. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “NONSTRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS” and inserting “PROJECTS USING NON-

STRUCTURAL, NATURAL, OR NATURE-BASED FEATURES”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “nonstructural flood control measures” and inserting “a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction measure using a non-structural feature, or a natural feature or nature-based feature (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))),”; and

(B) by striking “cash during construction of the project” and inserting “cash during construction for a nonstructural feature if the costs of land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations for such feature are estimated to exceed 35 percent”.

SEC. 115. FEASIBILITY STUDIES; REVIEW OF NATURAL AND NATURE-BASED FEATURES.

(a) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 1149(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2282 note; 132 Stat. 3787) is amended by striking “natural infrastructure alternatives” and inserting “natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (32 U.S.C. 2289a))”.

(b) **SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall include in each feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) for a project that contains a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction element, a summary of the natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives that were evaluated in the development of the feasibility report, and, if such alternatives were not included in the recommended plan, an explanation of why such alternatives were not included into the recommended plan.

SEC. 116. REPORT ON CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report that describes—

(1) the extent to which the Secretary has carried out section 1033 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2350);

(2) the extent to which the Secretary has incorporated corrosion prevention activities (as defined in such section) at water resources development projects constructed or maintained by the Secretary since the date of enactment of such section; and

(3) in instances where the Secretary has not incorporated corrosion prevention activities at such water resources development projects since such date, an explanation as to why such corrosion prevention activities have not been incorporated.

SEC. 117. QUANTIFICATION OF BENEFITS FOR FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECTS IN SEISMIC ZONES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the non-Federal interest for a flood risk management project in a seismic zone, the Secretary shall quantify the seismic hazard risk reduction benefits for the project if the non-Federal interest identifies, and the Secretary approves, an acceptable methodology to quantify such benefits.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) include all associated seismic hazard risk reduction benefits approved by the Secretary in the calculation of the national economic development benefit-cost ratio for a

flood risk management project in a seismic hazard zone for purposes of plan formulation pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986; and

(2) seek to maximize the combination of flood risk reduction and seismic hazard risk reduction benefits in the formulation of the national economic development alternative for such project.

SEC. 118. FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATION.

Section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In preparing a feasibility report under subsection (a) for a study that will benefit an economically disadvantaged community, upon request by the non-Federal interest for the study, the Secretary shall first determine the Federal interest in carrying out the study and the projects that may be proposed in the study.

“(2) **COST SHARE.**—The costs of a determination under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be at Federal expense; and

“(B) shall not exceed \$200,000.

“(3) **DEADLINE.**—A determination under paragraph (1) shall be completed by not later than 120 days after the date on which funds are made available to the Secretary to carry out the determination.

“(4) **TREATMENT.**—

“(A) **TIMING.**—The period during which a determination is being completed under paragraph (1) for a study shall not be included for purposes of the deadline to complete a final feasibility report under section 1001(a)(1) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(1)).

“(B) **COST.**—The cost of a determination under paragraph (1) shall not be included for purposes of the maximum Federal cost under section 1001(a)(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(2)).

“(5) **REPORT TO NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—If, based on a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that a study or project is not in the Federal interest because the project will not result, or is unlikely to result, in a recommended plan that will produce national economic development benefits greater than cost, but may result in a technically sound and environmentally acceptable plan that is otherwise consistent with section 904 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2281), the Secretary shall issue a report to the non-Federal interest with recommendations on how the non-Federal interest might modify the proposal such that the project could be in the Federal interest and feasible.”.

SEC. 119. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY FLOOD PROTECTION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program to evaluate opportunities to address the flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

(b) **PARTICIPATION IN PILOT PROGRAM.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) publish a notice in the Federal Register that requests from non-Federal interests proposals for the potential feasibility study of a flood risk management project or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction project for an economically disadvantaged community;

(2) upon request of a non-Federal interest for such a project, provide technical assistance to such non-Federal interest in the formulation of a proposal for a potential feasibility study to be submitted to the Secretary under the pilot program; and

(3) review such proposals and select 10 feasibility studies for such projects to be carried out by the Secretary, in coordination with the non-Federal interest, under this pilot program.

(c) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In selecting a feasibility study under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall consider whether—

(1) the percentage of people living in poverty in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the percentage of people living in poverty in the State, based on census bureau data;

(2) the percentage of families with income above the poverty threshold but below the average household income in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the percentage of the same for the State, based on census bureau data;

(3) the percentage of the population that identifies as belonging to a minority or indigenous group in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the average percentage in the State, based on census bureau data; and

(4) the project is addressing flooding or hurricane or storm damage effects that have a disproportionate impact on a rural community or a community of color (as such term is defined in section 111 of this Act), including Tribal or indigenous peoples.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 105(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215), the Federal share of the cost of a feasibility study carried out under the pilot program shall be 100 percent.

(e) **GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.**—When selecting feasibility studies under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall consider the geographic diversity among proposed projects.

(f) **STUDY REQUIREMENTS.**—Feasibility studies carried out under this subsection shall, to the maximum extent practical, incorporate natural features or nature-based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a)), or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(g) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of the selection of each feasibility study under the pilot program.

(h) **COMPLETION.**—Upon completion of a feasibility report for a feasibility study selected to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall transmit the report to Congress for authorization, and shall include the report in the next annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d).

(i) **SUNSET.**—The authority to commence a feasibility study under this section shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) **REPORT.**—Not later than 5 years and 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public

Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report detailing the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, including—

(1) a description of proposals received from non-Federal interests pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

(2) a description of technical assistance provided to non-Federal interests under subsection (b)(2); and

(3) a description of proposals selected under subsection (b)(3) and criteria used to select such proposals.

(k) **STATE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 120. PERMANENT MEASURES TO REDUCE EMERGENCY FLOOD FIGHTING NEEDS FOR COMMUNITIES SUBJECT TO REPETITIVE FLOODING.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AFFECTED COMMUNITY.**—The term “affected community” means a legally constituted public body (as that term is used in section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b))—

(A) with jurisdiction over an area that has been subject to flooding in two or more events in any 10-year period; and

(B) that has received emergency flood-fighting assistance, including construction of temporary barriers by the Secretary, under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) with respect to such flood events.

(2) **NATURAL FEATURE; NATURE-BASED FEATURE.**—The terms “natural feature” and “nature-based feature” have the meanings given those terms in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a).

(b) **PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program to study, design, and construct water resources development projects through measures involving, among other things, strengthening, raising, extending, realigning, or otherwise modifying existing flood control works, designing new works, and incorporating natural features, nature-based features, or nonstructural features, as appropriate to provide flood and coastal storm risk management to affected communities.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practical, review and, where appropriate, incorporate natural features or nature-based features, or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a project described in paragraph (1) without further congressional authorization if—

(i) the Secretary determines that the project—

(I) is advisable to reduce the risk of flooding for an affected community; and

(II) produces benefits that are in excess of the estimated costs; and

(ii) the Federal share of the cost of the construction does not exceed \$15,000,000.

(B) **SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.**—If the Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) exceeds \$15,000,000, the Secretary shall submit the project recommendation to Congress for authorization prior to construction, and shall include the project recommendation in the next annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

(C) **FINANCING.**—

(i) **CONTRIBUTIONS.**—If, based on a study carried out pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that a project described in paragraph (1) will not produce benefits greater than cost, the Secretary shall allow the affected community to pay, or provide contributions equal to, an amount sufficient to make the remaining costs of design and construction of the project equal to the estimated value of the benefits of the project.

(ii) **EFFECT ON NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—Amounts provided by an affected community under clause (i) shall be in addition to any payments or contributions the affected community is required to provide toward the remaining costs of design and construction of the project under section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

(4) **ABILITY TO PAY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any cost-sharing agreement for a project entered into pursuant to this section shall be subject to the ability of the affected community to pay.

(B) **DETERMINATION.**—The ability of any affected community to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary.

(C) **EFFECT OF REDUCTION.**—Any reduction in the non-Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) as a result of a determination under this paragraph shall not be included in the Federal share for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3).

SEC. 121. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following—

“(5) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—

“(A) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after receiving, from a non-Federal sponsor of a project to repair or rehabilitate a flood control work described in paragraph (1), a request to initiate a feasibility study to further modify the relevant flood control work to provide for an increased level of protection, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal sponsor a written decision on whether the Secretary has the authority under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) to undertake the requested feasibility study.

“(B) **RECOMMENDATION.**—If the Secretary determines under subparagraph (B) that the Secretary does not have the authority to undertake the requested feasibility study, the Secretary shall include the request for a feasibility study in the annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL” and inserting “ELIGIBILITY”;

(B) in paragraph (1), in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “LEVEE OWNER’S MANUAL”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **COMPLIANCE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding the status of compliance of a non-Federal interest with the requirements of a levee owner’s manual described in paragraph (1), or with any other eligibility requirement established by the Secretary related to the maintenance and upkeep responsibilities of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall consider the non-Federal interest to be eligible for repair and rehabilitation assistance under this section if the non-Federal interest—

“(i) enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that identifies any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary prior to the natural disaster; and

“(ii) pays, during performance of the repair and rehabilitation work, all costs to address—

“(I) any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary; and

“(II) any repair or rehabilitation work necessary to address damage the Secretary attributes to such deferred or inadequate maintenance or upkeep.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary may only enter into one agreement under subparagraph (A) with any non-Federal interest.

“(C) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into agreements under paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

SEC. 122. STUDY ON NATURAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF NATURAL FEATURE AND NATURE-BASED FEATURE.—In this section, the terms “natural feature” and “nature-based feature” have the meanings given those terms in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, a report on the results of a study on the consideration by the Secretary of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in the study of the feasibility of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the Secretary to consider natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in project feasibility studies;

(2) an assessment, based on information from relevant Federal and non-Federal sources, of—

(A) the costs, benefits, and effects associated with natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features recommended by the Secretary for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration; and

(B) the effectiveness of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features;

(3) an analysis of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration that have incorporated natural infrastructure, natural features, or nature-based features to identify best practices, including for measuring project benefits and costs;

(4) a description of any statutory, fiscal, regulatory, or other policy barriers to the appropriate consideration and use of a full array of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in carrying out feasibility studies and projects; and

(5) any recommendations for changes to law, or to fiscal, regulatory, or other policies, to improve the use of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based

features by the Corps of Engineers in carrying out feasibility studies and projects.

SEC. 123. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

Section 6002 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1349) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6002. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

“(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of projects constructed by the Secretary for which the Secretary continues to have financial or operational responsibility.

“(b) INVENTORY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall, based on the assessment carried out under subsection (a), develop an inventory of projects or portions of projects—

“(1) that are not needed for the missions of the Corps of Engineers;

“(2) the modification of which, including though the use of natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)), could improve the sustainable operations of the project, or reduce operation and maintenance costs for the project; or

“(3) that are no longer having project purposes adequately met by the Corps of Engineers, because of deferment of maintenance or other challenges, and the divestment of which to a non-Federal entity could better meet the local and regional needs for operation and maintenance.

“(c) CRITERIA.—In conducting the assessment under subsection (a) and developing the inventory under subsection (b), the Secretary shall use the following criteria:

“(1) The extent to which the project aligns with the current missions of the Corps of Engineers.

“(2) The economic and environmental impacts of the project on existing communities in the vicinity of the project.

“(3) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project could reduce operation and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

“(4) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project is in the public interest.

“(5) The extent to which investment of additional Federal resources in the project proposed for divestment or modification, including investment needed to bring the project to a good state of repair, is in the public interest.

“(6) The extent to which the authorized purpose of the project is no longer being met.

“(d) RECOMMENDATIONS OF NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—A non-Federal interest for a project may recommend that the Secretary include such project in the assessment or inventory required under this section.

“(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon completion of the inventory required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, a report containing the findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment and inventory required under this section.

“(2) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall list in an appendix any recommendation of a non-Federal interest made with respect to a project under subsection (d) that the Secretary determines not to include in the inventory developed under subsection (b), based on the criteria in subsection (c), including information about the request and the reasons for the Secretary’s determination.”.

SEC. 124. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MULTIPURPOSE PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in coordination with non-Federal interests, should maximize the development, evaluation, and recommendation of project alternatives for future water resources development projects that produce multiple project benefits, such as navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem restoration benefits, including through the use of natural or nature-based features and the beneficial reuse of dredged material.

SEC. 125. BENEFICIAL REUSE OF DREDGED MATERIAL; DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) NATIONAL POLICY ON THE BENEFICIAL REUSE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States for the Corps of Engineers to maximize the beneficial reuse, in an environmentally acceptable manner, of suitable dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects.

(2) PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating the placement of dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and

(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities.

(B) CALCULATION OF FEDERAL STANDARD.—The economic benefits and efficiencies from the beneficial use of dredged material considered by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be included in any determination relating to the “Federal standard” by the Secretary under section 335.7 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations for the placement or disposal of such material.

(b) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM PROJECTS.—Section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “20” and inserting “30”.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in selecting projects for the beneficial reuse of dredged materials under section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note), should ensure the thorough evaluation of project submissions from rural, small, and economically disadvantaged communities.

(c) FIVE-YEAR REGIONAL DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the District Commander of each district of the Corps of Engineers that obtains dredged material through the construction or operation and maintenance of a water resources development project shall, at Federal expense, develop and submit to the Secretary a 5-year dredged material management plan in coordination with relevant State agencies and stakeholders.

(2) SCOPE.—Each plan developed under this subsection shall include—

(A) a dredged material budget for each watershed or littoral system within the district;

(B) an estimate of the amount of dredged material likely to be obtained through the

construction or operation and maintenance of all water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during the 5-year period following submission of the plan, and the estimated timing for obtaining such dredged material;

(C) an identification of potential water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during such 5-year period that are suitable for, or that require, the placement of dredged material, and an estimate of the amount of dredged material placement capacity of such projects;

(D) an evaluation of—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and

(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities; and

(E) the district-wide goals for beneficial reuse of the dredged material, including any expected cost savings from aligning and coordinating multiple projects (including projects across Corps districts) in the reuse of the dredged material.

(3) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—In developing each plan under this subsection, each District Commander shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Upon submission of each plan to the Secretary under this subsection, each District Commander shall make the plan publicly available, including on a publicly available website.

(d) **DREDGE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **REVISIONS.**—Section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “for the operation and maintenance of harbors and inland harbors” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “for the operation and maintenance of—

“(1) harbors and inland harbors referred to in section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)); or

“(2) inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “or inland harbors” and inserting “, inland harbors, or inland or intracoastal waterways”.

(2) **COORDINATION WITH EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary may carry out the dredge pilot program authorized by section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) in coordination with Federal regional dredge demonstration programs in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 126. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION FOR ANADROMOUS FISH.

(a) **ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT AND PASSAGE.**—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT AND PASSAGE.**—

“(A) **MEASURES.**—A project under this section may include measures to improve habitat or passage for anadromous fish, including—

“(i) installing fish bypass structures on small water diversions;

“(ii) modifying tide gates; and

“(iii) restoring or reconnecting floodplains and wetlands that are important for anadromous fish habitat or passage.

“(B) **BENEFITS.**—A project that includes measures under this paragraph shall be formulated to maximize benefits for the anadromous fish species benefitted by the project.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary shall give projects that include measures described in subsection (a)(3) equal priority for implementation as other projects under this section.”.

SEC. 127. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 7001(c)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) the Secretary shall not include proposals in the appendix of the annual report that otherwise meet the criteria for inclusion in the annual report solely on the basis that the proposals are for the purposes of navigation, flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, or municipal or agricultural water supply; and”.

SEC. 128. HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration program to determine the causes of, and implement measures to effectively detect, prevent, treat, and eliminate, harmful algal blooms associated with water resources development projects.

(b) **CONSULTATION; USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PROGRAM AUTHORITIES.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the heads of appropriate Federal and State agencies; and

(2) make maximum use of existing Federal and State data and ongoing programs and activities of Federal and State agencies, including the activities of the Secretary carried out through the Engineer Research and Development Center pursuant to section 1109 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 610 note).

(c) **FOCUS AREAS.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall undertake program activities related to harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes, the tidal and inland waters of the State of New Jersey, the coastal and tidal waters of the State of Louisiana, the waterways of the counties that comprise the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, and Lake Okeechobee, Florida.

SEC. 129. UPDATE ON INVASIVE SPECIES POLICY GUIDANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall periodically update the Invasive Species Policy Guidance, developed under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610) and the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), in accordance with the most recent National Invasive Species Council Management Plan developed pursuant to Executive Order 13112.

(b) **INCLUSION.**—The Secretary may include in the updated guidance invasive species specific efforts at federally authorized water resources development projects located in—

(1) high-altitude lakes; and

(2) the Tennessee and Cumberland River basins.

SEC. 130. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.

Section 1210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3808) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1210. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.

“Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report that describes—

“(1) the extent to which, during the 10 fiscal years prior to such date of enactment, the Secretary has carried out section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a);

“(2) how the Secretary has evaluated potential work to be carried out under that section; and

“(3) the extent to which the Secretary plans to start, continue, or complete debris removal activities in the 3 years following submission of the report.”.

SEC. 131. MISSOURI RIVER INTERCEPTION-REARING COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the effects of any interception-rearing complex constructed on the Missouri River on—

(1) flood risk management and navigation; and

(2) the population recovery of the pallid sturgeon, including baseline population counts.

(b) **NO ADDITIONAL IRC CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary may not authorize construction of an interception-rearing complex on the Missouri River until the Secretary—

(1) submits the report required by subsection (a);

(2) acting through the Engineer Research and Development Center, conducts further research on interception-rearing complex design, including any effects on existing flows, flood risk management, and navigation; and

(3) develops a plan—

(A) to repair dikes and revetments that are affecting flood risk and bank erosion; and

(B) to establish, repair, or improve water control structures at the headworks of constructed shallow water habitat side-channels.

(c) **FUTURE IRC CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for comment from the public and the Governor of each affected State on any proposals to construct an interception-rearing complex after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **PERIOD.**—The public comment period required by paragraph (1) shall be not less than 90 days for each proposal to construct an interception-rearing complex on the Missouri River.

SEC. 132. COST AND BENEFIT FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(a)(2)(B) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(I), by inserting “, or provide contributions equal to,” after “pay”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “AND CONTRIBUTIONS” after “OF PAYMENTS”;;

(B) by inserting “or contributions” after “Non-Federal payments”; and

(C) by inserting “or contributions” after “non-Federal payments”.

(b) **CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.**—Section 1161(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 701n note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the “three fiscal years preceding” and inserting “five fiscal years preceding”; and

(B) by striking “last day of the third fiscal year” and inserting “last day of the fifth fiscal year”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or provide contributions equal to,” before “an amount sufficient”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The Secretary determines that the damage to the structure was not as a result of negligent operation or maintenance.”

SEC. 133. MATERIALS, SERVICES, AND FUNDS FOR REPAIR, RESTORATION, OR REHABILITATION OF PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any area covered by an emergency or major disaster declaration declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary is authorized to accept and use materials, services, and funds, during the period the declaration is in effect, from a non-Federal interest or private entity to repair, restore, or rehabilitate a federally authorized water resources development project, and to provide reimbursement to such non-Federal interest or private entity for such materials, services, and funds, in the Secretary's sole discretion, and subject to the availability of appropriations, if the Secretary determines that reimbursement is in the public interest.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may only reimburse for the use of materials or services accepted under this section if such materials or services meet the Secretary's specifications and comply with all applicable laws and regulations that would apply if such materials and services were acquired by the Secretary, including sections 3141 through 3148 and 3701 through 3708 of title 40, United States Code, section 8302 of title 41, United States Code, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the acceptance of materials, services, or funds under this section, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest or private entity shall enter into an agreement that specifies—

(A) the non-Federal interest or private entity shall hold and save the United States free from any and all damages that arise from use of materials or services of the non-Federal interest or private entity, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;

(B) the non-Federal interest or private entity shall certify that the materials or services comply with all applicable laws and regulations under subsection (b); and

(C) any other term or condition required by the Secretary.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If an agreement under paragraph (1) was not entered prior to materials or services being contributed, a non-Federal interest or private entity shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary that—

(A) specifies the value, as determined by the Secretary, of those materials or services contributed and eligible for reimbursement; and

(B) ensures that the materials or services comply with subsection (b) and paragraph (1).

SEC. 134. LEVEE SAFETY.

Section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each levee included in an inventory established under subsection (b) or for which the Secretary has conducted a review under subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify the specific engineering and maintenance deficiencies, if any; and

“(B) describe the recommended remedies to correct each deficiency identified under subparagraph (A), and, if requested by owner of a non-Federal levee, the associated costs of those remedies.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In identifying deficiencies and describing remedies for a levee under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with relevant non-Federal interests, including by providing an opportunity for comment by those non-Federal interests.”

SEC. 135. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) has an emergency action plan that—

“(I) is approved by the relevant State dam safety agency; or

“(II) is in conformance with State law and pending approval by the relevant State dam safety agency;”;

(ii) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) fails to meet minimum dam safety standards of the State in which the dam is located, as determined by the State; and

“(v) poses an unacceptable risk to the public, as determined by the Administrator, in consultation with the Board.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting

“under a hydropower project with an authorized installed capacity of greater than 1.5 megawatts” after “dam”; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”; and

(B) by striking “The term ‘non-Federal sponsor’” and inserting “The term ‘eligible subrecipient’”.

(b) REHABILITATION OF HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Section 8A(a) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(a)) is amended by striking “to non-Federal sponsors” and inserting “to States with dam safety programs”.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Section 8A(b) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(b)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “for a project may be used for” and inserting “to a State may be used by the State to award grants to eligible subrecipients for”.

(3) AWARD OF GRANTS.—Section 8A(c) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “State”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an eligible high hazard potential dam to a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “eligible high hazard potential dams to a State”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “PROJECT GRANT” and inserting “GRANT”; and

(II) by striking “project grant agreement with the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “grant agreement with the State”; and

(III) by striking “project,” and inserting “projects for which the grant is awarded,”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) GRANT ASSURANCE.—As part of a grant agreement under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall require that each eligible subrecipient to which the State awards a grant under this section provides an assurance, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient, that the dam owner will carry out a plan for maintenance of the dam during the expected life of the dam.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “A grant provided under this section shall not exceed” and inserting “A State may not

award a grant to an eligible subrecipient under this section that exceeds, for any 1 dam,”.

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(d) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to an eligible subrecipient” after “this section”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor shall” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient shall, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient”; and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) demonstrate that the community in which the dam is located participates in, and complies with, all applicable Federal flood insurance programs, including demonstrating that such community is participating in the National Flood Insurance Program, and is not on probation, suspended, or withdrawn from such Program;”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking “have” and inserting “beginning not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator publishes criteria for hazard mitigation plans under paragraph (3), demonstrate that the Tribal or local government with jurisdiction over the area in which the dam is located has”; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking “50-year period” and inserting “expected life of the dam”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN CRITERIA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall publish criteria for hazard mitigation plans required under paragraph (2)(B).”.

(5) FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 8A(e) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) PLAN CRITERIA AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall provide criteria, and may provide technical support, for the development and implementation of floodplain management plans prepared under this subsection.”.

(6) CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(i)(1) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(i)(1)) is amended by striking “a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient”.

SEC. 136. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED PUMP STATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PUMP STATION.—The term “eligible pump station” means a pump station—

(A) constructed, in whole or in part, by the Corps of Engineers for flood risk management purposes;

(B) that the Secretary has identified as having a major deficiency; and

(C) the failure of which the Secretary has determined would impair the function of a flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REHABILITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station, means to address a major deficiency of

the eligible pump station caused by long-term degradation of the foundation, construction materials, or engineering systems or components of the eligible pump station.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station, includes—

(i) the incorporation into the eligible pump station of—

- (I) current design standards;
- (II) efficiency improvements; and
- (III) associated drainage; and

(ii) increasing the capacity of the eligible pump station, subject to the condition that the increase shall—

(I) significantly decrease the risk of loss of life and property damage; or

(II) decrease total lifecycle rehabilitation costs for the eligible pump station.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary may carry out rehabilitation of an eligible pump station, if the Secretary determines that the rehabilitation is feasible.

(c) **COST SHARING.**—The non-Federal interest for the eligible pump station shall—

(1) provide 35 percent of the cost of rehabilitation of an eligible pump station carried out under this section; and

(2) provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations associated with the rehabilitation described in subparagraph (A), at no cost to the Federal Government.

(d) **AGREEMENT REQUIRED.**—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary—

(1) to pay the non-Federal share of the costs of rehabilitation under subsection (c); and

(2) to pay 100 percent of the operation and maintenance costs of the rehabilitated eligible pump station, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(e) **TREATMENT.**—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a separable element of the associated flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 137. NON-FEDERAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2026”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of the pilot program that, to the extent practicable, identifies—

“(i) the metrics for measuring the success of the pilot program;

“(ii) a process for identifying future projects to participate in the pilot program;

“(iii) measures to address the risks of a non-Federal interest constructing projects under the pilot program, including which entity bears the risk for projects that fail to meet the Corps of Engineers standards for design or quality;

“(iv) the laws and regulations that a non-Federal interest must follow in carrying out a project under the pilot program; and

“(v) which entity bears the risk in the event that a project carried out under the pilot program fails to be carried out in ac-

cordance with the project authorization or this subsection.

“(B) **NEW PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a project partnership agreement under this subsection during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ending on the date on which the Secretary issues the guidance under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 138. DEFINITION OF ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” for the purposes of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the criteria under paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 301(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161), to the extent that such criteria are applicable in relation to the development of water resources development projects.

(c) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—In developing the guidance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

SEC. 139. COST SHARING PROVISIONS FOR TERRITORIES AND INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 1156(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310(b)) is amended by striking “for inflation” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “on an annual basis for inflation.”.

SEC. 140. FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES.

Section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **RENEGOTIATION OF TERMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest may renegotiate the terms and conditions of an eligible deferred payment, including—

“(i) permitting the non-Federal contribution to be made without interest, pursuant to paragraph (1);

“(ii) recalculation of the interest rate;

“(iii) full or partial forgiveness of interest accrued during the period of construction; and

“(iv) a credit against construction interest for a non-Federal investment that benefits the completion or performance of the project or separable element.

“(B) **ELIGIBLE DEFERRED PAYMENT.**—An eligible deferred payment agreement under subparagraph (A) is an agreement for which—

“(i) the non-Federal contribution was made with interest;

“(ii) the period of project construction exceeds 10 years from the execution of a project partnership agreement or appropriation of funds; and

“(iii) the construction interest exceeds \$45,000,000.

“(C) **CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to credit any costs incurred by the non-Federal interest (including in-kind contributions) to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a covered project or separable element toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the covered project, if the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the

completion or performance of the covered project.

“(ii) **CREDIT OF COSTS.**—If the non-Federal interest incurs costs or in-kind contributions for a project to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a project or separable element which has a 100 percent Federal cost share, and the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the completion or performance of the project, the Secretary is authorized to credit such costs to any interest accrued on a deferred non-Federal contribution.”.

SEC. 141. REVIEW OF CONTRACTING POLICIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall complete a review of the policies, guidelines, and regulations of the Corps of Engineers for the development of contractual agreements between the Secretary and non-Federal interests and utilities associated with the construction of water resources development projects.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after completing the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

(1) a summary of the results of the review; and

(2) public guidance on best practices for non-Federal interest to use when writing or developing contractual agreements with the Secretary and utilities.

(c) **PROVISION OF GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall provide the best practices guidance included under subsection (b)(2) to non-Federal interests prior to the development of contractual agreements.

SEC. 142. BUY AMERICA.

With respect to all Corps of Engineers construction and rehabilitation contracts to be awarded after the date of enactment of this Act, the steel components furnished and delivered under such contracts shall be manufactured or fabricated in whole or substantial part in the United States with steel produced or made in the United States, its territories, or possessions.

SEC. 143. ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

Concurrent with each report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works a report that provides for an accounting of all outstanding feasibility studies being conducted by the Secretary, including, for each such study, its length, cost, and expected completion date.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress:

(1) **TONTO CREEK, GILA RIVER, ARIZONA.**—Project for flood risk management, Tonto Creek, Gila River, Arizona.

(2) **SULPHUR RIVER, ARKANSAS AND TEXAS.**—Project for ecosystem restoration, Sulphur River, Arkansas and Texas.

(3) **CABLE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Project for flood risk management, water supply, and related benefits, Cable Creek, California.

(4) DEL MAR BLUFFS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for shoreline stabilization, Del Mar Bluffs, San Diego County, California.

(5) REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for water conservation and water supply, Redbank and Fancher Creeks, California.

(6) RIO HONDO CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Rio Hondo Channel, San Gabriel River, California.

(7) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for coastal storm damage reduction, Southern California.

(8) SHINGLE CREEK AND KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and water storage, Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Osceola County, Florida.

(9) ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND LAKE JESUP, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, St. John's River and Lake Jesup, Florida.

(10) WAIMEA RIVER, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management, Waimea River, Kauai, Hawaii.

(11) CHICAGO AREA WATERWAYS SYSTEM, ILLINOIS.—Project for ecosystem restoration, recreation, and other purposes, Illinois River, Chicago River, Calumet River, Grand Calumet River, Little Calumet River, and other waterways in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois.

(12) FOX RIVER, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood risk management, Fox River, Illinois.

(13) LOWER MISSOURI RIVER, KANSAS.—Project for bank stabilization and navigation, Lower Missouri River, Sioux City, Kansas.

(14) TANGIPAHOA PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood risk management, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana.

(15) KENT NARROWS AND CHESTER RIVER, MARYLAND.—Project for navigation, Kent Narrows and Chester River, Queen Anne's County, Maryland.

(16) BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Boston, Massachusetts, pursuant to the comprehensive study authorized under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

(17) LOWER ST. CROIX RIVER, MINNESOTA.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Lower St. Croix River, Minnesota.

(18) ESCATAWPA RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Escatawpa River, Jackson County, Mississippi.

(19) LONG BEACH, BAY ST. LOUIS AND MISSISSIPPI SOUND, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and flood risk management, Long Beach, Bay St. Louis and Mississippi Sound, Mississippi.

(20) PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

(21) TALLAHOMA AND TALLAHALA CREEKS, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for flood risk management, Leaf River, Jones County, Mississippi.

(22) LOWER OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MISSOURI.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri.

(23) UPPER BASIN AND STONY BROOK (GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN), RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY.—Reevaluation of the Upper Basin and Stony Brook portions of the project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), including the evaluation of nonstructural measures to achieve the project purpose.

(24) LAKE ONTARIO SHORELINE, NEW YORK.—Project for coastal storm resiliency, Lake Ontario shoreline, New York.

(25) WADING RIVER CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, flood risk management, naviga-

tion, and ecosystem restoration, Wading River Creek, New York.

(26) REEL POINT PRESERVE, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation and shoreline stabilization, Reel Point Preserve, New York.

(27) GOLDSMITH INLET, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Goldsmith Inlet, New York.

(28) TUSCARAWAS RIVER BASIN, OHIO.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio.

(29) LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN (TURNING BASIN), OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—Project to improve and add turning basins for the project for navigation, Columbia River Channel, Oregon and Washington, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280).

(30) WILLIAMSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management and levee rehabilitation, greater Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

(31) CITY OF CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for tidal- and inland-related flood risk management, Charleston, South Carolina.

(32) TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVER BASINS, TENNESSEE.—Project to deter, impede, or restrict the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species in the Tennessee and Cumberland River Basins, Tennessee.

(33) SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TEXAS.—Modification of the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1184), and authorized as a separable element of the project for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, authorized by item 3 of section 1401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3838), to reduce the risk of flooding through the construction of improvements to interior drainage.

(34) PORT OF VICTORIA, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, Port of Victoria, Texas.

(35) LOWER FOX RIVER BASIN, WISCONSIN.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Lower Fox River Basin, Wisconsin.

(36) UPPER FOX RIVER AND WOLF RIVER, WISCONSIN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Upper Fox River and Wolf River, Wisconsin.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary shall consider any study carried out by the Secretary to formulate the modifications to the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, identified in subsection (a)(33) to be a continuation of the study carried out for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, Texas, authorized by a resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, approved June 23, 2004, and funded by title IV of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Construction" (Public Law 115-123; 132 Stat. 76).

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETIONS.

(a) FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study for each of the following projects, and if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project:

(1) Project for navigation, St. George Harbor, Alaska.

(2) Project for shoreline stabilization, Aunu'u Harbor, American Samoa.

(3) Project for shoreline stabilization, Tutuila Island, American Samoa.

(4) Project for flood risk management, Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(5) Project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes, Coyote Valley Dam, California.

(6) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Del Rosa Channel, city of San Bernardino, California.

(7) Project for flood risk management, Lower Cache Creek, California.

(8) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Mission-Zanja Channel, cities of San Bernardino and Redlands, California.

(9) Project for shoreline protection, Ocean-side, California, authorized pursuant to section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2636; 121 Stat. 1176).

(10) Project for flood risk management, Prado Basin, California.

(11) Project to modify the project for navigation, San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California.

(12) Project to modify the Seven Oaks Dam, California, portion of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113; 101 Stat. 1329-111; 104 Stat. 4611; 110 Stat. 3713; 121 Stat. 1115), to include water conservation as an authorized purpose.

(13) Project to modify the project for navigation, Delaware River Mainstem and Channel Deepening, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802; 113 Stat. 300; 114 Stat. 2602), to include the construction of a turning basin located near the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal.

(14) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida.

(15) Project for comprehensive hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Chicago, Illinois, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664; 113 Stat. 302).

(16) Project for flood risk management, Wheaton, DuPage County, Illinois.

(17) Project for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Blue River Basin, Kansas City, Kansas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on September 24, 2008 (docket number 2803).

(18) Project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries east of the Mississippi River, Louisiana.

(19) Project for coastal storm risk management, Upper Barataria Basin, Louisiana.

(20) Project to replace the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

(21) Project to deepen the project for navigation, Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4094).

(22) Project for flood risk management, Rahway River Basin, New Jersey.

(23) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Highlands, New Jersey.

(24) Project for navigation, Shark River, New Jersey.

(25) Project for flood risk management, Rondout Creek-Walkkill River Watershed, New York, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 2, 2007 (docket number 2776).

(26) Project for ecosystem restoration and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Spring Creek South (Howard Beach), Queens, New York.

(27) Project to resolve increased silting and shoaling adjacent to the Federal channel, Port of Bandon, Coquille River, Oregon.

(28) Project for flood control, 42nd Street Levee, Springfield, Oregon, being carried out

under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(29) Project for ecosystem restoration, Hood River at the confluence with the Columbia River, Oregon.

(30) Project for flood risk management, Rio Culebrinas, Puerto Rico.

(31) Project for flood risk management, Rio Grande de Manati, Puerto Rico.

(32) Project for flood risk management, Rio Guayanilla, Puerto Rico.

(33) Project for flood risk management, Dorchester County, South Carolina.

(34) Project for navigation, Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina.

(35) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

(36) Project to modify the projects for navigation and other purposes, Old Hickory Lock and Dam and the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, Cumberland River, Tennessee, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), to add flood risk management as an authorized purpose.

(37) Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and related purposes, Lower Rio Grande River, Cameron County, Texas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 21, 2003 (docket number 2710).

(38) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Bolongo Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(39) Project for flood risk management, Savan Gut Phase II, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(40) Project for flood risk management, Turpentine Run, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(41) Project for navigation, North Landing Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Virginia.

(b) **POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall expedite completion of a post-authorization change report for the following projects:

(1) Project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona.

(2) Project for flood control, San Luis Rey River, California.

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida.

(4) Project for ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Caloosahatchee River C-43, West Basin Storage Reservoir, Florida.

(5) Project for flood risk management, Des Moines Levee System, including Birdland Park Levee, Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Des Moines, Iowa.

(c) **WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of an assessment under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), for the following:

(1) Kansas River Basin, Kansas.

(2) Merrimack River Basin, Massachusetts.

(d) **DISPOSITION STUDIES.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a disposition study, carried out under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), for the following:

(1) The disposition of the project for Salinas Reservoir (Santa Margarita Lake), California.

(2) The partial disposition of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock facility and surrounding real property, in accordance with the requirements of section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 132 Stat. 3812).

SEC. 203. FEASIBILITY STUDY MODIFICATIONS.

(a) **SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 142 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2930) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, and along the ocean shoreline of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties,” after “Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers”;

(2) by inserting “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the feasibility of and the Federal interest in providing measures to adapt to rising sea levels” after “tidal and fluvial flooding”;

(3) by striking “investigation” and inserting in its place “investigations”; and

(4) by inserting after “San Francisco Bay region” the following: “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines and streams running to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the effects of proposed measures or improvements on the local economy; habitat restoration, enhancement, or expansion efforts or opportunities; public infrastructure protection and improvement; stormwater runoff capacity and control measures, including those that may mitigate flooding; erosion of beaches and coasts; and any other measures or improvements relevant to adapting to rising sea levels”.

(b) **SACRAMENTO RIVER, SOUTHERN SUTTER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The study for flood control and allied purposes for the Sacramento River Basin, authorized by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1197), is modified to authorize the Secretary to conduct a study for flood risk management, southern Sutter County between the Sacramento River and Sutter Bypass, California.

(c) **SALTON SEA, CALIFORNIA.**—In carrying out the program to implement projects to restore the Salton Sea, California, authorized by section 3032 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1113; 130 Stat. 1677), the Secretary is authorized to carry out a study for the construction of a perimeter lake, or a northern or southern subset thereof, for the Salton Sea, California.

(d) **NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR AND TRIBUTARIES, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.**—The study for flood and storm damage reduction for the New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries project, authorized by the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132), and being carried out pursuant to the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2), is modified to require the Secretary to—

(1) evaluate and address the impacts of low-frequency precipitation and sea-level rise on the study area;

(2) consult with affected communities; and

(3) ensure the study is carried out in accordance with section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c).

SEC. 204. SELMA, ALABAMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

(1) provides an update on the study for flood risk management and riverbank stabilization, Selma, Alabama, authorized by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works and Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on June 7, 1961, and April 28, 1936, respectively, the completion of which the Secretary was required to expedite by section 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3803); and

(2) identifies project alternatives necessary to—

(A) assure the preservation of cultural and historic values associated with national historic landmarks within the study area; and

(B) provide flood risk management for economically disadvantaged communities within the study area.

SEC. 205. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER, YOLO BYPASS, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Sacramento River in the vicinity of the Yolo Bypass System, California, to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the Yolo Bypass System for the purposes of flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—

(1) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with the Governor of the State of California, applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, non-Federal interests, the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership, and other stakeholders.

(2) **USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PRIOR STUDIES.**—To the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, the Secretary may—

(A) make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by the entities identified in paragraph (1); and

(B) incorporate—

(i) relevant information from prior studies and projects carried out by the Secretary within the study area; and

(ii) the latest technical data and scientific approaches to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Yolo Bypass System for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive study authorized under subsection (a).

(d) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the results of the comprehensive study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations developed under subsection (c);

(2) any additional, site-specific areas within the Yolo Bypass System where additional study for flood risk management or ecosystem restoration projects is recommended by the Secretary; and

(3) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **YOLO BYPASS SYSTEM.**—The term “Yolo Bypass System” means the system of weirs,

levees, bypass structures, and other water resources development projects in California's Sacramento River Valley, extending from the Fremont Weir near Woodland, California, to the Sacramento River near Rio Vista, California, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144; 39 Stat. 949).

(2) **YOLO BYPASS AND CACHE CLOUGH PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership” means the group of parties to the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Memorandum of Understanding, effective May 2016, regarding collaboration and cooperation in the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough region.

SEC. 206. LAKE OKEECHOBEE REGULATION SCHEDULE, FLORIDA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the review of the Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule pursuant to section 1106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3773), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the implications of prohibiting releases from Lake Okeechobee through the S-308 and S-80 lock and dam structures on the operation of the lake in accordance with unauthorized purposes and seek to minimize unnecessary releases to coastal estuaries; and

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the ongoing efforts of Federal and State agencies responsible for monitoring, forecasting, and notification of cyanobacteria levels in Lake Okeechobee.

(b) **MONTHLY REPORT.**—Each month, the Secretary shall make public a report, which may be based on the Water Management Daily Operational Reports, disclosing the volumes of water deliveries to or discharges from Lake Okeechobee & Vicinity, Water Conservation Area I, Water Conservation Area II, Water Conservation Area III, East Coast Canals, and the South Dade Conveyance. Such report shall be aggregated and reported in a format designed for the general public, using maps or other widely understood communication tools.

(c) **EFFECT.**—In carrying out the evaluation under subsection (a)(1), nothing shall be construed to authorize any new purpose for the management of Lake Okeechobee or authorize the Secretary to affect any existing authorized purpose, including flood protection and management of Lake Okeechobee to provide water supply for all authorized users.

SEC. 207. GREAT LAKES COASTAL RESILIENCY STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the comprehensive assessment of water resources needs for the Great Lakes System under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), as required by section 1219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811), the Secretary shall—

(1) taking into account recent high lake levels within the Great Lakes, assess and make recommendations to Congress on—

(A) coastal storm and flood risk management measures, including measures that use natural features and nature-based features, as those terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a);

(B) operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, as such term is defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238);

(C) ecosystem protection and restoration;

(D) the prevention and control of invasive species and the effects of invasive species; and

(E) recreation associated with water resources development projects;

(2) prioritize actions necessary to protect critical public infrastructure, communities,

and critical natural or cultural resources; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize existing data provided to the Secretary by Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders, including data obtained through other Federal programs.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS; ADDITIONAL STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Great Lakes System for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a).

(c) **EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to any study recommended under subsection (b)(1)(D).

SEC. 208. RATHBUN LAKE, CHARITON RIVER, IOWA.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that evaluates—

(1) the existing allocations of storage space for Rathbun Lake, authorized pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1262; 121 Stat. 1124), including the existing allocation for municipal water supply;

(2) the feasibility of expanding the existing allocation of storage for municipal water supply; and

(3) the affordability of future municipal water supply allocations from Rathbun Lake, for residential users of such future allocations, at projected future costs.

SEC. 209. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF RESTORATION IN THE LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force established by section 7004 of Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1272) shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes the activities and recommendations of the task force, including—

(1) policies, strategies, plans, programs, projects, and activities undertaken for addressing conservation, protection, restoration, and maintenance of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem; and

(2) financial participation by each agency represented on the Task Force in conserving, protecting, restoring, and maintaining the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

SEC. 210. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Lower Mississippi River basin, from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, to the Gulf of Mexico,

to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the basin for the purposes of flood risk management, navigation, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(2) **FOCUS AREAS.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall investigate projects, including—

(A) projects proposed in the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions), including—

(i) Ama sediment diversion;

(ii) Union freshwater diversion;

(iii) increase Atchafalaya flow to Terrebonne; and

(iv) Manchac Landbridge diversion; and

(B) natural features and nature-based features, including levee setbacks and instream and floodplain restoration.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian Tribes, non-Federal interests, and other stakeholders, and, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by such parties.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Lower Mississippi River basin for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under this subsection shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive study required under subsection (a).

(d) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the results of the comprehensive study required by this section, including any recommendations developed under subsection (c); and

(2) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

SEC. 211. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the water resources needs of the Upper Mississippi River under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the assessment under subsection (a) in accordance with the requirements in section 1206(b) of Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1686).

SEC. 212. LOWER MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD RISK AND RESILIENCY STUDY, IOWA, KANSAS, NEBRASKA, AND MISSOURI.

(a) **ADDITIONAL STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the request of the non-Federal interest for the Lower Missouri Basin study, the Secretary shall expand the scope of such study to investigate and provide recommendations relating to—

(A) modifications to projects in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri authorized under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9(b) of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 891)) and the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation project (authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 19)), including modifications to the authorized purposes of such projects to further flood risk management and resiliency; and

(B) modifications to non-Federal, publicly owned levees in the Lower Missouri River Basin.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—If the Secretary determines that expanding the scope of the Lower Missouri Basin study as provided in paragraph (1) is not practicable, and the non-Federal interest for such study concurs in such determination, the Secretary shall carry out such additional studies as are necessary to investigate the modifications described in paragraph (1).

(3) **CONTINUATION OF LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.**—The following studies shall be considered a continuation of the Lower Missouri Basin study:

(A) Any additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(B) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for the Lower Missouri Basin study.

(C) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for an additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(D) Any study spun off from the Lower Missouri Basin study before the completion of such study.

(E) Any study spun off from an additional study carried out under paragraph (2) before the completion of such additional study.

(4) **RELiance ON EXISTING INFORMATION.**—In carrying out any study described in or authorized by this section, the Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall rely on existing data and analysis, including data and analysis prepared under section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16).

(5) **CONSIDERATION; CONSULTATION.**—In developing recommendations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consider the use of—

(i) structural and nonstructural measures, including the setting back of levees and removing structures from areas of recurring flood vulnerability, where advantageous, to reduce flood risk and damages in the Lower Missouri River Basin; and

(ii) where such features are locally acceptable, natural features or nature-based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a); and

(B) consult with applicable Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders within the Lower Missouri River Basin and solicit public comment on such recommendations.

(6) **EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to the Lower Missouri Basin study or any study described in paragraph (3).

(7) **PRECONSTRUCTION, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN.**—Upon completion of a study authorized by this section, if the Secretary determines that a recommended project, or modification to a project described in paragraph (1), is justified, the Secretary may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project or modification.

(8) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For the provision of technical assistance to support small communities and economically disadvantaged communities in the planning and design of flood risk management and flood risk resiliency projects in the Lower Missouri River Basin, for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2026, there are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) \$2,000,000 to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section; and

(ii) \$2,000,000 to carry out section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—

(i) **LIMITATIONS NOT APPLICABLE.**—The limitations on the use of funds in section 206(d) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 and section 22(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 shall not apply to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by subparagraph (A).

(ii) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph restricts the authority of the Secretary to use any funds otherwise appropriated to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 or section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 to provide technical assistance described in subparagraph (A).

(9) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(A) the results of the study authorized by this section;

(B) any additional, site-specific areas within the Lower Missouri River Basin for which additional study for flood risk management projects is recommended by the Secretary; and

(C) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.**—The term “Lower Missouri Basin study” means the Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri, authorized pursuant to section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a).

(2) **SMALL COMMUNITY.**—The term “small community” means a local government that serves a population of less than 15,000.

SEC. 213. PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER AND RYE HARBOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding—

(1) efforts to address the impacts of shoaling affecting the project for navigation, Rye Harbor, New Hampshire, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480); and

(2) the project for navigation, Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of

1962 (76 Stat. 1173), as required to be expedited under section 1317 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–270).

SEC. 214. COUGAR AND DETROIT DAMS, WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREGON.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report providing an initial analysis of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of the potential effects of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project on—

(A) the operation of the project, including with respect to the other authorized purposes of the project;

(B) compliance of the project with the Endangered Species Act;

(C) costs that would be attributed to other authorized purposes of the project, including costs relating to compliance with such Act; and

(D) other ongoing studies in the Willamette River Basin; and

(2) identification of any further research needed.

(c) **PROJECT DEFINED.**—In this section, the terms “Cougar and Detroit Dams project” and “project” mean the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project and Detroit Dam and Reservoir project, Willamette River Basin, Oregon, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

SEC. 215. PORT ORFORD, OREGON.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, at Federal expense, submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a summary report on the research completed and data gathered by the date of enactment of this Act with regards to the configuration of a breakwater for the project for navigation, Port Orford, Oregon, authorized by section 117 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1822; 106 Stat. 4809), for the purposes of addressing shoaling issues to minimize long-term maintenance costs.

SEC. 216. WILSON CREEK AND SLOAN CREEK, FAIRVIEW, TEXAS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding efforts to address flooding along Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek in the City of Fairview, Texas.

SEC. 217. GAO STUDY ON MITIGATION FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the mitigation of the impact of water resources development projects, including the impact on fish and wildlife, consistent with the requirements of section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283), section 307(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2317(a)), and section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2283a), including—

(A) an evaluation of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the Secretary to ensure successful mitigation of such impacts;

(B) a review of the methods of mitigation, including the use of in-lieu fees, mitigation banking, and permittee-responsible mitigation, and their long-term effectiveness of restoring or mitigating ecosystem services impacted by such projects;

(C) a review of how the use of the different mitigation methods for such projects varies across Corps of Engineers districts;

(D) an assessment of the backlog of mitigation projects, including the number of mitigation projects pending completion to address such impacts resulting from constructed water resources development projects;

(E) an evaluation of how the Secretary tracks compliance with the mitigation requirements across Corps of Engineers districts;

(F) a review of how the mitigation requirements for water resources development projects contributes to the resilience of water resources in the United States;

(G) an assessment of whether mitigation is being done prior to or contemporaneously with the construction of projects, as required by section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283);

(H) an evaluation of compliance with section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)) for the development of specific mitigation plans for projects, whether such plans were successful in mitigating the designated impacts of the projects, and, in instances where such plans were not successful, what actions the Secretary is taking to modify the plans such that they will be successful; and

(I) an assessment of how the Secretary might take advantage of natural infrastructure in mitigation planning to reduce flood risks and flood recovery costs for some communities; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that—

(A) describes the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1);

(B) includes recommendations to ensure compliance with and successful implementation of mitigation requirements for water resources development projects; and

(C) includes recommendations to ensure existing programs and authorities include the use, to the maximum extent practicable, of natural infrastructure.

SEC. 218. GAO STUDY ON APPLICATION OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND EXPENDITURES.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the operation and maintenance needs of federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects, including—

(1) an inventory of all federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects;

(2) an assessment of current uses of such projects (and, to the extent practicable, the national, regional, and local benefits of such uses), including the uses listed in section 210(d)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986;

(3) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2) of section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238), including a breakdown of such needs for each of the following types of projects—

(A) emerging harbor projects (as defined in such section);

(B) moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act);

(C) high-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); and

(D) projects assigned to harbors and inland harbors within the Great Lakes Navigation System (as defined in such section);

(4) an assessment of any deferred operation and maintenance needs for such projects;

(5) an assessment of the annual funding level trends for moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-121), excluding funds awarded to donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201));

(6) an assessment of projected needs associated with donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201)); and

(7) an itemization of expenditures provided to donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports under section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201).

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Upon completion of the report under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit such report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

SEC. 219. GAO STUDY ON ADMINISTRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL BANKS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that analyzes the administration of section 309 of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act to establish an environmental bank (as defined in such section), such that the Secretary—

(1) achieves the objectives of the report of the Chief of Engineers for ecosystem restoration in the Louisiana Coastal Area or the objectives of the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions);

(2) promotes ridge restoration, barrier island restoration, marsh creation, non-structural risk management, or any other projects authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken, pursuant to such comprehensive coastal protection master plan;

(3) allows for proactive investment in projects by a public or private entity seeking to generate credits to satisfy responsibilities associated with environmental compliance;

(4) allows for leveraging additional State, Parish, or Federal funds; and

(5) recommends methods for awarding additional credit for high-priority projects listed in the report and plan described in paragraph (1).

(b) **CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the Secretary, the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, the Governor of Louisiana (or an appointee), and other stakeholders, to the extent practicable.

SEC. 220. STUDY ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONCESSIONAIRE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Com-

troller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of, a study on commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies as they relate to the pricing of items sold by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities, including commoditized goods such as fuel and food items;

(2) an assessment of the impact of gross revenue fees on—

(A) the sales of items described in paragraph (1);

(B) the total revenues collected by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities; and

(C) the amounts of the moneys paid by such concessionaires to the United States—

(i) amounts equivalent to which are appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities; or

(ii) that are distributed to States and counties under section 7 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701c-3);

(3) an assessment of the potential impact of using a fixed revenue fee on the sales, revenues, and amounts described in paragraph (2);

(4) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies related to the length of commercial concessionaire contracts;

(5) an assessment of the impacts of changing the length of commercial concessionaire contracts to a minimum of 25 years, including assessment of—

(A) the potential effects on monetary investment in Corps of Engineers properties by commercial concessionaires, including whether establishing such a minimum contract length would lead to increased investment; and

(B) whether establishing such a minimum contract length would reduce competition, or result in commercial concessionaires providing less value to the public or to water resources development projects; and

(6) an assessment of whether changes in the concessionaire fee structure or the minimum length of a commercial concessionaire contract is in the public interest.

SEC. 221. STUDY ON WATER SUPPLY AND WATER CONSERVATION AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that analyzes the benefits and consequences of including municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers in carrying out water resources development projects.

(b) **INCLUSION.**—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of existing water resources development projects with municipal water supply or water conservation as authorized purposes, and the extent to which such projects are utilized for such purposes;

(2) a description of existing water resources development projects with respect to which—

(A) municipal water supply or water conservation could be added as a project purpose, including those with respect to which a

non-Federal interest has expressed an interest in adding municipal water supply or water conservation as a project purpose; and

(B) such a purpose could be accommodated while maintaining existing authorized purposes;

(3) a description of ongoing water resources development project studies the authorizations for which include authorization for the Secretary to study the feasibility of carrying out the project with a purpose of municipal water supply or water conservation;

(4) an analysis of how adding municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers would affect the ability of the Secretary to carry out future water resources development projects; and

(5) any recommendations of the Secretary relating to including municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 222. PFAS REVIEW AND INVENTORY AT CORPS FACILITIES.

(a) INVENTORY OF PFAS AT CORPS FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter the Secretary shall complete an inventory of Corps of Engineers civil works facilities that are or may be contaminated, or could become contaminated, by PFAS.

(2) CONTENTS OF INVENTORY.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall review and identify—

(A) all facilities owned or operated by the Corps of Engineers, for which there is a civil works function, that are or may be contaminated, or could become contaminated, by PFAS;

(B) the nature and extent of any such contamination or potential for contamination, including any potential pathways for human exposure to PFAS;

(C) response measures taken to monitor, control, remove, or remediate PFAS, or otherwise reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS;

(D) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the extent to which such facilities (or any such contamination or potential for contamination at such facilities) are related to the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers;

(E) the extent to which the Secretary, or other entities, may have responsibility for such contamination or potential for contamination; and

(F) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the costs to remediate and reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS.

(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the actions taken under this subsection shall supplement and support work undertaken by other Federal agencies, including actions taken pursuant to the plan published by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, titled “EPA’s Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan” and dated February 2019.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the inventory under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter concurrent with the President’s annual budget request to Congress, the Secretary shall submit the inventory to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(b) PFAS TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—

(1) RESEARCH SUPPORT.—The Secretary, acting through the Hazardous Waste Research Center located at the Engineer Research and Development Center, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, support the efforts of other Federal agencies in the devel-

opment of innovative technologies and methodologies for the detection, treatment, and cleanup of PFAS associated with Federal facilities, including groundwater associated with such facilities.

(2) DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to duplicate the activities undertaken by other Federal agencies as identified in subsection (a)(3).

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “PFAS” means a perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

SEC. 223. REPORT ON RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) an inventory of all recreational infrastructure and facilities associated with water resources development projects;

(2) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with such infrastructure and facilities;

(3) an assessment of deferred operation and maintenance needs for such infrastructure and facilities to operate safely at full capacity; and

(4) an assessment of the economic benefits of recreation to local and regional economies and benefits of sustaining and improving public access at recreational infrastructure and facilities.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to identify water resources development projects authorized by Congress that are no longer viable for construction due to—

(A) a lack of local support;

(B) a lack of available Federal or non-Federal resources; or

(C) an authorizing purpose that is no longer relevant or feasible;

(2) to create an expedited and definitive process for Congress to deauthorize water resources development projects that are no longer viable for construction; and

(3) to allow the continued authorization of water resources development projects that are viable for construction.

(b) PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(1) PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a preliminary list of each water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before November 8, 2007, for which—

(i) planning, design, or construction was not initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) planning, design, or construction was initiated before the date of enactment of this Act, but for which no funds, Federal or non-Federal, were obligated for planning, design, or construction of the project or separable element of the project during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

(B) USE OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REPORT.—The Secretary may develop the preliminary list from the comprehensive construction backlog and operation and maintenance reports developed pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a).

(2) PREPARATION OF PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(A) DEAUTHORIZATION AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall prepare a proposed list of projects for deauthorization comprised of a subset of projects and separable elements identified on the preliminary list developed under paragraph (1) that have, in the aggregate, an estimated Federal cost to complete that is at least \$10,000,000,000.

(B) DETERMINATION OF FEDERAL COST TO COMPLETE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the Federal cost to complete shall take into account any allowances authorized by section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), as applied to the most recent project schedule and cost estimate.

(C) INCLUSION OF DEAUTHORIZATION OF ANTIQUATED PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount identified for deauthorization under paragraph (2)(A) by an amount equivalent to the estimated current value of each project, or separable element of a project, that is deauthorized by subsection (f).

(3) SEQUENCING OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall identify projects and separable elements for inclusion on the proposed list of projects for deauthorization under paragraph (2) according to the order in which the projects and separable elements were authorized, beginning with the earliest authorized projects and separable elements and ending with the latest project or separable element necessary to meet the aggregate amount under paragraph (2)(A).

(B) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—The Secretary may identify projects and separable elements in an order other than that established by subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a project or separable element is critical for interests of the United States, based on the possible impact of the project or separable element on public health and safety, the national economy, or the environment.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall solicit comments from the public and the Governors of each applicable State on the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A).

(B) COMMENT PERIOD.—The public comment period shall be 90 days.

(5) PREPARATION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a final deauthorization list by—

(i) considering any comments received under paragraph (4); and

(ii) revising the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A) as the Secretary determines necessary to respond to such comments.

(B) APPENDIX.—The Secretary shall include as part of the final deauthorization list an appendix that—

(i) identifies each project or separable element on the proposed deauthorization list that is not included on the final deauthorization list; and

(ii) describes the reasons why the project or separable element is not included on the final deauthorization list.

(c) SUBMISSION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST TO CONGRESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW; PUBLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the close of the comment period under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall—

(A) submit the final deauthorization list and appendix prepared under subsection (b)(5) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(B) publish the final deauthorization list and appendix in the Federal Register.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary shall not include in the final deauthorization list submitted under paragraph (1) any project or separable element with respect to which Federal funds for planning, design, or construction are obligated after the development of the preliminary list under subsection (b)(1)(A) but prior to the submission of the final deauthorization list under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

(d) DEAUTHORIZATION; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of publication of the final deauthorization list and appendix under subsection (c)(1)(B), a project or separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list is hereby deauthorized, unless Congress passes a joint resolution disapproving the final deauthorization list prior to the end of such period.

(2) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A project or separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list under subsection (c) shall not be deauthorized under this subsection if, before the expiration of the 2-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the non-Federal interest for the project or separable element of the project provides sufficient funds to complete the project or separable element of the project.

(B) TREATMENT OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), each project and separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list shall be treated as deauthorized for purposes of the aggregate deauthorization amount specified in subsection (b)(2)(A).

(3) PROJECTS IDENTIFIED IN APPENDIX.—A project or separable element of a project identified in the appendix to the final deauthorization list shall remain subject to future deauthorization by Congress.

(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) POST-AUTHORIZATION STUDIES.—A project or separable element of a project may not be identified on the proposed deauthorization list developed under subsection (b), or the final deauthorization list developed under subsection (c), if the project or separable element received funding for a post-authorization study during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

(2) TREATMENT OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—For purposes of this section, if an authorized water resources development project or separable element of the project has been modified by an Act of Congress, the date of the authorization of the project or separable element shall be deemed to be the date of the most recent such modification.

(f) DEAUTHORIZATION OF ANTIQUATED PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction prior to November 17, 1986, for which construction has not been initiated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or for which funds have not been obligated for construction in the 10-year period prior to the date of enactment of this Act, is hereby deauthorized.

(2) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that identifies—

(A) the name of each project, or separable element of a project, deauthorized by paragraph (1); and

(B) the estimated current value of each such project or separable element of a project.

(g) ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF INACTIVE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary or the non-Federal interest may not carry out any authorized water resources development project, or separable element of such project, for which construction has not been initiated in the 20-year period following the date of the authorization of such project or separable element, until—

(1) the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a post-authorization change report that updates the economic and environmental analysis of the project or separable element; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate take appropriate action to address any modifications to the economic and environmental analysis for the project or separable element of the project contained in the post-authorization change report.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORT.—The term “post-authorization change report” has the meaning given such term in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2282e).

(2) POST-AUTHORIZATION STUDY.—The term “post-authorization study” means—

(A) a feasibility study developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282);

(B) a feasibility study, as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)); or

(C) a review conducted under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), including an initial appraisal that—

(i) demonstrates a Federal interest; and

(ii) requires additional analysis for the project or separable element.

(3) WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.—The term “water resources development project” includes an environmental infrastructure assistance project or program of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 302. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE NONCOAL MINE RESTORATION.

Section 560(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2336(f)) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”.

SEC. 303. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 203(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended by striking “\$12,500,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

SEC. 304. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662, 100 Stat. 4148; 110 Stat. 3758; 113 Stat. 295; 121 Stat. 1076) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) Ellis Pond and Guild Pond, Norwood, Massachusetts; and

“(30) Memorial Pond, Walpole, Massachusetts.”

SEC. 305. WATERCRAFT INSPECTION STATIONS.

Section 104(d)(1)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “Arizona River Basins,” and inserting “Arkansas River Basins; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) to protect the Russian River Basin, California.”

SEC. 306. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED DAMS.

Section 1177 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 467f-2 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

SEC. 307. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303, 110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202; 128 Stat. 1317) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) PROJECT CAP.—The total cost of a project carried out under this section may not exceed \$15,000,000.”; and

(2) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

(b) OUTREACH AND TRAINING.—The Secretary shall conduct public outreach and workshops for non-Federal interests to provide information on the Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program established under section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, including how to participate in the program.

SEC. 308. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1103(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “\$22,750,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “\$10,420,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

SEC. 309. MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM.

Any Federal funds, regardless of the account from which the funds were provided, used to carry out construction of the modification to the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, authorized in section 136 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1842), shall be considered by the Secretary as initiating construction of the project such that future funds will not require a new investment decision.

SEC. 310. OUACHITA-BLACK RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, ARKANSAS.

The project for navigation, Ouachita-Black River, Arkansas, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645), is modified to include water supply as a project purpose, subject to completion by the Secretary of a feasibility study and any other review necessary for such modification.

SEC. 311. SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 103 Stat. 649; 110 Stat. 3709; 112 Stat. 1841; 113 Stat. 299), consisting of a riverbed gradient restoration facility at the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Intake, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 312. LAKE ISABELLA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, when evaluating alternative locations for construction

of a permanent Isabella Lake Visitor Center by the Corps of Engineers to replace the facility impacted by the Isabella Dam safety modification project, should afford substantial weight to the site preference of the local community.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may acquire such interests in real property as the Secretary determines necessary or advisable to support construction of the Isabella Dam safety modification project.

(c) **TRANSFER.**—The Secretary may transfer any real property interests acquired under subsection (b) to any other Federal agency or department without reimbursement.

(d) **ISABELLA DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION PROJECT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Isabella Dam safety modification project” means the dam safety modification project at the Isabella Reservoir in the San Joaquin Valley, California (authorized by Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 901)), including the component of the project relating to construction a visitor center facility.

SEC. 313. LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.

The Secretary shall align the schedules of, and maximize complimentary efforts, minimize duplicative practices, and ensure coordination and information sharing with respect to—

(1) the project for flood risk management, Lower San Joaquin River, authorized by section 1401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3836); and

(2) the second phase of the feasibility study for the Lower San Joaquin River project for flood risk management, authorized for expedited completion by section 1203(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act 2018 (132 Stat. 3803).

SEC. 314. SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of the project for flood control and navigation, San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego County, California, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), identified in the National Levee Database established under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) as the San Diego River 3 segment and consisting of a 785-foot-long segment of the right bank levee from Station 209+41.75 to its end at Station 217+26.75, as described in construction plans dated August 30, 1951, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 315. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 114 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 59h) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 114. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.

“(a) **AREA TO BE DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE.**—The following area is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States: All of that portion of the City and County of San Francisco, California, lying shoreward of a line beginning at the intersection of the southerly right of way line of Earl Street prolongation with the Pierhead United States Government Pierhead line, the Pierhead line as defined in the State of California Harbor and Navigation Code Section 1770, as amended in 1961; thence northerly along said Pierhead line to its intersection with a line parallel with and distant 10 feet easterly from, the existing easterly boundary line of Pier 30-32; thence northerly along said parallel line and its northerly prolongation, to a point of intersection with a line parallel with, and distant 10 feet northerly from, the existing northerly boundary of Pier 30-32; thence westerly along last said parallel line to its intersection with said

Pierhead line; thence northerly along said Pierhead line, to the intersection of the easterly right of way line of Van Ness Avenue, formerly Marlette Street, prolongation to the Pierhead line.

“(b) **REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.**—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) applies only to those parts of the area described in subsection (a) that are or will be bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied or covered by permanent structures and does not affect the applicability of any Federal statute or regulation that relates to filling of navigable waters or to other regulated activities within the area described in subsection (a), including sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401, 403), section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

“(c) **INCLUSION OF EMBARCADERO HISTORIC DISTRICT.**—Congress finds and declares that the area described in subsection (a) contains the seawall, piers, and wharves that comprise the Embarcadero Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places on May 12, 2006.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5052 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 59h-1) is repealed.

SEC. 316. WESTERN PACIFIC INTERCEPTOR CANAL, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the Sacramento River, authorized by section 2 of the of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 45 Stat. 539; 50 Stat. 877; 55 Stat. 647; 80 Stat. 1422), consisting of the portion of the levee from GPS coordinate N2147673.584 E6690904.187 to N2147908.413 E6689057.060 associated with the Western Pacific Interceptor Canal, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 317. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.

Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114, 121 Stat. 1213; 128 Stat. 1314) is amended by striking “2019” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 318. NEW LONDON HARBOR WATERFRONT CHANNEL, CONNECTICUT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The portion of the project for navigation, New London Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 13, 1902 (chapter 1079, 32 Stat. 333), described in subsection (b) is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **AREA DESCRIBED.**—The area referred to in subsection (a) is generally the portion between and around the 2 piers at the State Pier in New London, specifically the area—

(1) beginning at a point N691263.78, E1181259.26;

(2) running N 35°01'50.75" W about 955.59 feet to a point N692046.26, E1180710.74;

(3) running N 54°58'06.78" E about 100.00 feet to a point N692103.66, E1180792.62;

(4) running S 35°01'50.75" E about 989.8 feet to a point N691293.17, E1181360.78; and

(5) running S 73°51'15.45" W about 105.69 feet to the point described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 319. WASHINGTON HARBOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Washington Harbor, District of Columbia, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1031), is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized dimensions are as follows:

(1) A 200 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with a center line beginning at a point East 1,317,064.30 and North 440,373.32, thence to a point East 1,316,474.30 and North 440,028.31,

thence to a point East 1,315,584.30 and North 439,388.30, thence to a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30.

(2) A transition area 200 foot wide to 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep, with a center line beginning at a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30 to a point East 1,315,044.31 and North 438,748.30.

(3) A 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with a centerline beginning a point East 1,315,044.31 and North 438,748.30, thence to a point East 1,314,105.31 and North 438,124.79, thence to a point East 1,311,973.30 and North 438,807.78, thence to a point East 1,311,369.73 and North 438,577.42, thence to a point East 1,311,015.73 and North 438,197.57, thence to a point East 1,309,713.47 and North 435,678.91.

(4) A transition area 300 foot wide to 400 foot wide, 15 foot deep to 24 foot deep, with a center line beginning at a point East 1,309,713.47 and North 435,678.91 to a point East 1,307,709.33 and North 434,488.25.

(5) A 400 foot wide, 24 foot deep channel with a centerline beginning at a point East 1,307,709.33 and North 434,488.25, thence to a point East 1,307,459.33 and North 434,173.25, thence to a point East 1,306,476.82 and North 1,306,476.82, thence to a point East 1,306,209.79 and North 431,460.21, thence to a point at the end of the channel near Hains Point East 1,305,997.63 and North 429,978.31.

SEC. 320. BIG CYPRESS SEMINOLE INDIAN RESERVATION WATER CONSERVATION PLAN, FLORIDA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 528 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3767), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 321. CENTRAL EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Central Everglades, authorized by section 1401(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1713), is modified to include the project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida, Everglades Agricultural Area, authorized by section 1308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3819), and to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project as so combined.

SEC. 322. MIAMI RIVER, FLORIDA.

The portion of the project for navigation, Miami River, Florida, authorized by the Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 925; 59 Stat. 16; 74 Stat. 481; 100 Stat. 4257), beginning at the existing railroad bascule bridge and extending approximately 1,000 linear feet upstream to an existing salinity barrier and flood control structure, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 323. JULIAN KEEN, JR. LOCK AND DAM, MOORE HAVEN, FLORIDA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The Moore Haven Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida, authorized pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1032), shall hereafter be known and designated as the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Lock and Dam referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam”.

SEC. 324. TAYLOR CREEK RESERVOIR AND LEVEE L-73 (SECTION 1), UPPER ST. JOHNS RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.

The portions of the project for flood control and other purposes, Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176), consisting of the Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L-73, Section 1, within the Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida, are no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 325. CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LOUISIANA.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on plans to modify the Calcasieu River and Pass Dredged Material Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (December 16, 2010 DMMP/SEIS) to allow for the expansion of Dredged Material Placement Facilities (DMPFs) 17, 19, 22, D, and E to the lakeside foreshore rock boundaries during planned rehabilitation of these facilities.

SEC. 326. SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT; ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.

(a) ABIQUIU RESERVOIR.—Section 5(b) of Public Law 97-140 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended by striking “a total of two hundred thousand acre-feet of”.

(b) WATER STORAGE AT ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.—Section 1 of Public Law 100-522 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended—

(1) by striking “200,000 acre-feet of”;

(2) by inserting “and San Juan-Chama project” after “Rio Grande system”; and

(3) by striking “, in lieu of the water storage authorized by section 5 of Public Law 97-140, to the extent that contracting entities under section 5 of Public Law 97-140 no longer require such storage”.

(c) WATER STORAGE.—The Secretary shall—

(1) store up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29 at Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico, to the extent that the necessary real property interests have been acquired by any entity requesting such storage; and

(2) amend the March 20, 1986, contract between the United States of America and the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (assigned by the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico to the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority) for water storage space in Abiquiu Reservoir to allow for storage by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29.

(d) STORAGE AGREEMENTS WITH USERS OTHER THAN THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) retain or enter into new agreements with entities for a proportionate allocation of 29,100 acre-feet of storage space pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 97-140; and

(2) amend or enter into new storage agreements for storage of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to the space allocated for each entity's proportionate share of San Juan-Chama water.

(e) OPERATIONS DOCUMENTS.—The Secretary shall amend or revise any existing operations documents, including the Water Control Manual or operations plan for Abiquiu Reservoir, as necessary to meet the requirements of this section.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the following limitations shall apply:

(1) The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall be subject to the provisions of the Rio Grande Compact and the resolutions of the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

(2) The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall only be authorized to the extent that the necessary water ownership and storage rights have been acquired by the entity requesting such storage.

(3) The storage of native Rio Grande system water or San-Juan Chama project water shall not interfere with the authorized purposes of the Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir project.

(4) Each user of storage space, regardless of source of water, shall pay for any increase in costs attributable to storage of that user's water.

SEC. 327. PAWCATUCK RIVER, LITTLE NARRAGANSETT BAY AND WATCH HILL COVE, RHODE ISLAND AND CONNECTICUT.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, that portion of the project for navigation, Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 13), consisting of a 10-foot deep, 16-acre anchorage area in Watch Hill Cove is no longer authorized.

SEC. 328. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.

Section 575 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is repealed.

SEC. 329. CAP SANTE WATERWAY, WASHINGTON.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Cap Sante Waterway and Navigation Channel, Skagit County, Washington, authorized by the Act of March 2, 1919 (chapter 95, 40 Stat. 1285), is modified to deauthorize the portion of the project consisting of an approximately 334,434 foot area of the Federal channel within Anacortes Harbor inside and directly adjacent to the Federal breakwater and training wall structure, starting at a point with coordinates N557015.552, E1210819.619, thence running S88 13°2.06'E approximately 200 feet to a point with coordinates N557009.330, E1211019.522, thence running S01 46°58.08'W approximately 578 feet to a point with coordinates N556431.405, E1211001.534, thence running S49 49°50.23'W approximately 69 feet to a point with coordinates N556387.076, E1210949.002, thence running S51 53°0.25'E approximately 35 feet to a point with coordinates N556365.662, E1210976.316, thence running S49 38°58.48'W approximately 112 feet to a point with coordinates N556292.989, E1210890.775, thence running N88 13°1.87'W approximately 109 feet to a point with coordinates N556296.367, E1210782.226, thence running S46 46°58.97'W approximately 141 feet to a point with coordinates N556199.527, E1210679.164, thence running N88 13°1.77'W approximately 700 feet to a point with coordinates N556221.305, E1209979.502, thence running N01 46°58.08'E approximately 250 feet to a point with coordinates N556471.184, E1209987.280, thence running S88 13°1.77'E approximately 815 feet to a point with coordinates N556445.828, E1210801.886, thence running N01 46°58.08'E approximately 570 feet to the point of origin.

SEC. 330. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.

The Secretary shall expedite the activities required to be carried out under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) regarding the use of improvement dredging of the Portsmouth Federal navigation project in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, as a source of clean beach fill material to reinforce the stone revetment at Nantasket Beach, Hull, Massachusetts.

SEC. 331. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS.

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this section are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(b) MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat.

336; 117 Stat. 1840) is amended to read as follows:

“(23) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—\$45,000,000 for regional water conservation, recycling, reliability, and resiliency projects in Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties and the San Juan Suburban Water District, California.”.

(2) SOUTH PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(52) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

(3) MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(55) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A-221) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$45,000,000”.

(4) SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.—Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3773; 113 Stat. 348; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1226) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting “Boyd, Carter, Elliott, Lincoln,” after “Lee,”; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$80,000,000”.

(5) DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220; 119 Stat. 282; 119 Stat. 2257; 122 Stat. 1623) is amended by striking “\$75,000,000” and inserting “\$130,000,000”.

(6) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 1494; 121 Stat. 1258) is amended by striking “\$32,500,000” and inserting “\$57,500,000”.

(7) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Section 219(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 337; 121 Stat. 1233) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$70,000,000”.

(8) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 219(f)(231) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1266) is amended by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

(9) SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1146) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “\$200,000,000” and inserting “\$400,000,000”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2), by inserting “Beaver, Jefferson,” after “Washington,”.

(10) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220; 117 Stat. 1838; 130 Stat. 1677; 132 Stat. 3818) is amended by striking “\$89,550,000” and inserting “\$110,000,000”.

(11) EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(269) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1268) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

(12) WESTERN RURAL WATER.—Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440; 121 Stat. 1219; 123 Stat. 2851; 128 Stat. 1316; 130 Stat. 1681) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting “WESTERN RURAL WATER.”;

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “Arizona,” before “rural Idaho.”;

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting “Arizona,” before “Idaho”; and

(D) in subsection (i), by striking “for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, \$435,000,000, to remain available until expended.” and inserting the following: “, to remain available until expended—

“(1) for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, \$435,000,000 for Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming; and

“(2) \$150,000,000 for Arizona.”.

(13) CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.—Section 571(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371; 121 Stat. 1257) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

(14) SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.—Section 340(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856; 110 Stat. 3727; 113 Stat. 320) is amended by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$120,000,000”.

(c) LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA.—Section 5032(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114, 121 Stat. 1205) is amended by striking “15” and inserting “20”.

SEC. 332. PROJECT MODIFICATION AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) WATER SUPPLY.—The following project modifications for water supply, as identified in the report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” dated February 2019, and submitted to Congress on June 3, 2019, pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the recommendations, included in such report pursuant to section 301(c) of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b(c)):

(1) The project modification for the State of Missouri, Clarence Cannon Dam and Mark Twain Lake Project Salt River, Missouri.

(2) The project modification for the City of Plattsburg, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(3) The project modification for the City of Smithville, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(b) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—The following project modifications for flood risk management, as identified in a report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, and submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary:

(1) Modification of the project for flood risk management, lower Mississippi River, authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat. 534), to incorporate the Wolf River Backwater and Nonconnah Creek levee systems into the project, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1575; 50 Stat. 881), subject to the determination of the Secretary that such systems meet all requirements applicable to such project.

(2) Modification of the project for flood risk management, Red River below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, authorized by the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1219), to incorporate the Cherokee Park Levee into the project, subject to the determination of the Secretary that such levee meets all requirements applicable to such project.

SEC. 333. APPLICATION OF CREDIT.

Section 7007(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1277; 128 Stat. 1226) is amended by inserting “, or may be applied to reduce the amounts required to be paid by the non-Federal interest under the terms of the deferred payment agreements entered into between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the projects authorized by section 7012(a)(1)” before the period at the end.

SEC. 334. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) MUDDY RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The separable elements for ecosystem restora-

tion of the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts, authorized by section 522 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2656), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(2) EAST CHESTER CREEK, NEW YORK.—Notwithstanding section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), the project for navigation, East Chester Creek, New York, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 164; 100 Stat. 4181), and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579(a)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(3) CHRISTIANSTED HARBOR, UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 167), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(4) CHARLOTTE HARBOR, UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Charlotte Amalie (St. Thomas) Harbor, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by the Act of August 26, 1937 (chapter 832, 50 Stat. 850), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall complete and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a post-authorization change report (as such term is defined in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2282e(d)) prior to carrying out a project identified in subsection (a).

SEC. 335. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) EUFAULA, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Eufaula, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in the Department of the Army Lease No. DACW01–2–17–0747, containing 56.76 acres, more or less, and being a part of Tracts L–1268 (26.12 acres), L–1273 (13.71 acres), L–1278 (6.75 acres), and L1279 (10.36 acres) of the Walter F. George Lock and Dam and Lake project.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Eufaula, Alabama, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Montgomery, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is the 62.38 acres of land and water under the primary jurisdiction of the Secretary in the R.E. “Bob” Woodruff Project Area that is covered by lease number DACW01–1–05–0037, including the parcels and structure known as “Powder Magazine”.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, to include retaining the right to inundate with water any land transferred under this subsection.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Montgomery, Alabama, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) OHIO RIVER LOCK AND DAM NUMBER 52, MASSAC COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property located north of the south bank of the Ohio River in Massac County, Illinois, that is associated with the Ohio River Lock and Dam 52.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) CLINTON, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(4) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is a tract of land situated in the S ½ of Section 12 and the N ½ of Section 13, Township 41 North, Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of the north line of said S ½ of Section 12 and the easterly right-of-way of State Highway No. 13; thence easterly along the north line of said S ½ to the northeast corner of the W ½ NW ¼ NE ¼ SW ¼ of said Section

12; thence southerly along the east line of said W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ to the southeast corner thereof; thence easterly along the north line of the S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 12 to the southwest corner of the W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 12; thence in a northeasterly direction to the northeast corner of said W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$; thence easterly along the north line of said S $\frac{1}{2}$ to the westerly right-of-way of the County Road; thence in a southeasterly and southerly direction along the westerly right-of-way of said County Road approximately 2500 feet to the center of Deer Creek; thence in a southwesterly direction along the center of said Deer Creek, approximately 3900 feet to the south line of said N $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 13; thence westerly along the south line of said N $\frac{1}{2}$ to the easterly right-of-way line of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad; thence in a northwesterly direction along the easterly right-of-way of said railroad to the easterly right-of-way of said State Highway No. 13; thence in a northeasterly direction along the easterly right-of-way of said State Highway No. 13 to the point of the beginning; and including a roadway easement for ingress and egress, described as a strip of land 80 feet in width, lying 40 feet on each side of the following described line, the initial extremities of the following described strip being extended or reduced as required to exactly adjoin the boundary lines which they meet, situated in the S $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 12, Township 41 North Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the center of said Section 12, thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to a point, thence N88°29'02"W, 483.97 feet to the point of beginning of the strip of land herein described; thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to the right, said curve having an initial tangent bearing of N3°44'41"E, a radius of 238.73 feet and an interior angle of 61°29'26", an arc distance of 256.21 feet to a point; thence N65°14'07"E 218.58 feet to a point; thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to the left, having a radius of 674.07 feet and an interior angle of 36°00'01", an arc distance of 423.53 feet to a point; thence N29°14'07"E, 417.87 feet to a point; thence northeasterly along a curve to the right, having a radius of 818.51 feet and an interior angle of 14°30'01", an arc distance of 207.15 feet to a point; thence N43°44'07"E, 57.00 feet to the southerly right-of-way line of a county road, containing 2,948 acres, more or less; Excluding therefrom a tract of land situated in the S $\frac{1}{2}$ of said Section 12, said Township and Range, described as commencing at the center of said Section 12; thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to the point of beginning of the tract of land herein described; thence N88°29'02"W, 1122.50 feet; thence S1°43'26"W, 872.62 feet; thence S88°29'02"E, 1337.36 feet; thence N1°43'26"E, 872.62 feet; thence N88°29'02"W, 214.86 feet to the point of beginning, containing 26.79 acres, more or less. The above described tract contains, in the aggregate, 177.69 acres, more or less.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(f) CITY OF CLINTON, OLD ORCHARD ADDITION, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, all right, title, and interest of the

United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is Lot 28 in Old Orchard Addition, a subdivision of the City of Clinton, Henry County, Missouri, containing 0.36 acres, more or less, including any improvements thereon.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Harry S. Truman Reservoir Project.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Clinton, Missouri, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) TRI-COUNTY LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the Tri-County Levee District, Missouri, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is the part of Sections 1 and 12 Township 45 North Range 6 West of the 5th P.M. in Montgomery County, Missouri, described as follows: A tract of land being 60' wide and lying South and East of and adjoining the centerline of the existing levee and being described as follows: Commencing at the NW corner of Section 12, thence S 87° 52' 35" E 587.4', thence S 01° 29' 25" W 453.68' to the point of the beginning; said point being in the center of the levee, thence with the centerline of the levee N 77° 01' 30" E 164.92', thence N 74° 26' 55" E 250.0', thence N 72° 27' 55" E 270.0', thence N 69° 06' 10" E 300.0', thence N 66° 42' 15" E 500.0', thence N 64° 14' 30" E 270.0', thence N 61° 09' 10" E 800.0', thence N 60° 58' 15" E 1724.45', thence leaving the centerline S 01° 10' 35" W 69.43', thence parallel with the above described centerline S 60° 58' 15" W 1689.62', thence S 61° 09' 10" W 801.71', thence S 64° 14' 30" W 272.91', thence S 66° 42' 15" W 502.55', thence S 69° 06' 10" W 303.02', thence S 72° 27' 55" W 272.8', thence S 74° 26' 55" W 252.39', thence S 77° 01' 30" W 181.75', thence leaving the South side of the levee N 01° 26' 25" E 61.96' to the point of beginning and containing 5.89 acres more or less.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The Tri-County Levee District, Missouri, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR., HOUSE, OHIO.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term "non-Federal entity" means the Friends of Joseph Barker, Jr., House, a nonprofit organization in the State of Ohio.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (6), the Secretary shall convey to the non-Federal entity, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in paragraph (3)(A).

(B) EASEMENT.—Upon conveyance of the property under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal entity, without consideration, an easement over the property described in paragraph (3)(B) for

access to the conveyed property for as long as the non-Federal entity is in legal possession of the conveyed property.

(3) DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(A) is the following (as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act):

(i) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR., HOUSE.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America parallel to and approximately 10 feet easterly of the toe of the existing dredge disposal berm, southeasterly approximately 326 feet to a point prior to the current Corps of Engineers access to the dredging spoil area; thence, northeasterly approximately 480 feet paralleling the top of the slope to the riverbank side of the house and approximately 25 feet northerly therefrom; thence, northwest approximately 302 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7; thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 485 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 3.51 acres.

(ii) ROAD TRACT.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America and with the House Parcel southeasterly 25 feet; thence, northeast, running parallel to said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 994 feet to a point of deflection; thence northeasterly 368 feet to a point beyond the existing fence corner; thence, east 140 feet to the edge of the existing Willow Island access road; thence with said access road, northwesterly approximately 62 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7; thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 1,491 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 1 acre.

(B) EASEMENT.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(B) is the following: The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7 and the northeast side of the existing Willow Island access road, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, southwest, running with said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 30 feet to a point on the southwest side of the existing access road, and corner to the road tract; thence with said access road and the line of the road parcel, southeasterly approximately 62 feet to a point; thence leaving the road parcel and crossing the existing access road northeasterly approximately 30 feet to a point located on the northeast side of the existing access road; thence, northwesterly approximately 62 feet, to the point of beginning, containing approximately 0.04 acre.

(4) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(5) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this

subsection is not being used by the non-Federal entity for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IMPROVEMENTS.—The Secretary shall make such improvements and alterations to the property described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) as the Secretary, in consultation with the non-Federal entity and relevant stakeholders, determines to be appropriate to facilitate conveyance of the property and provision of the easement under this subsection, subject to the condition that the total cost of those improvements and alterations undertaken by the Secretary shall be not more than \$120,000.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—Before making a conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(i) conduct, with respect to the property to be conveyed, an assessment of the environmental condition of the property, including an investigation of any potential hazardous, toxic, or radioactive waste present on such property; and

(ii) submit to the non-Federal entity a report describing the results of such assessment.

(C) REFUSAL BY NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon review by the non-Federal entity of the report under subparagraph (B), the non-Federal entity may elect to refuse the conveyance under this subsection.

(ii) ELECTION.—An election under clause (i)—

(I) shall be at the sole discretion of the non-Federal entity; and

(II) shall be made by the non-Federal entity by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of submission of the report under subparagraph (B)(ii).

(D) DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall—

(i) notify and coordinate with the non-Federal entity and relevant stakeholders before carrying out any dredged material placement activities associated with the property described in paragraph (3)(A) after the date on which such property is conveyed under this subsection; and

(ii) in carrying out a dredged material placement activity under clause (i), act in accordance with Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-5025 (or a subsequent version of that manual).

(7) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary may reserve and retain from any conveyance under this subsection a right-of-way or any other right that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the authorized Federal channel along the Ohio River.

(8) TREATMENT.—Conveyance to the non-Federal entity under this subsection of property described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall satisfy all obligations of the Secretary with respect to such property under—

(A) section 306101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(B) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code, with respect to the effects on the property of dredged material placement activities carried out by the Secretary after the date of the conveyances.

(9) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subtitle I of title 40, and chapter 4 of title 41, United States Code shall not apply to any conveyance or easement provided under this subsection.

(i) LEABURG FISH HATCHERY, LANE COUNTY, OREGON.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall convey, without consideration, to the State of Oregon, acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, all

right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising the Leaburg Fish Hatchery, consisting of approximately 21.55 acres, identified as tracts Q-1500, Q-1501E, and 300E-1 and described in Department of the Army Lease No. DACW57-1-18-0009, together with any improvements on the property.

(2) WATER RIGHTS.—The Secretary may transfer to the State of Oregon, acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, any water rights held by the United States that are appurtenant to the property conveyed under this subsection.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including a condition that all of the property conveyed under this subsection be used and maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used or maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity, all or any portion of the property, including any water rights transferred under this subsection, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—If the State of Oregon does not accept the conveyance under this subsection, the Secretary may dispose of the property, including appurtenant water rights, under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code.

(j) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS, WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREGON.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) REAL ESTATE APPENDIX.—The term “real estate appendix” means Appendix A of the document published by the District Commander of the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers, titled “Willamette Falls Locks Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment”.

(B) RECEIVING ENTITY.—The term “receiving entity” means an entity identified by the State of Oregon, in consultation with the Willamette Falls Locks Commission, to receive the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(C) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS PROJECT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks project” means the project for navigation, Willamette Falls Locks, Willamette River, Oregon, authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 664, chapter 382).

(D) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS REPORT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks report” means the memorandum of the Director of Civil Works with the subject “Willamette Falls Locks (WFL), Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment (Study)”, dated July 11, 2019.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the receiving entity, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any land in which the Federal Government has a property interest for the Willamette Falls Locks project, together with any improvements on the land, subject to the requirements of this subsection and in accordance with the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) SUBJECT TO EXISTING EASEMENTS AND OTHER INTERESTS.—The conveyance of property under paragraph (2) shall be subject to all existing deed reservations, easements,

rights-of-way, and leases that are in effect as of the date of the conveyance.

(5) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection cease to be held in public ownership, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) REQUIREMENTS BEFORE CONVEYANCE.—

(A) PERPETUAL ROAD EASEMENT.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall acquire a perpetual road easement from an adjacent property owner for use of an access road, which easement shall convey with the property conveyed under such paragraph.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), in accordance with the real estate appendix, the Secretary shall complete a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

(C) HISTORIC PRESERVATION.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that identifies actions the Secretary shall take before making the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(D) REPAIRS.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall carry out repairs to address primary seismic and safety risks in accordance with the recommendations approved in the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(7) DEAUTHORIZATION.—Beginning on the date on which the Secretary makes the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Willamette Falls Locks project is no longer authorized.

SEC. 336. REPEALS.

(a) Section 710 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2264) is repealed.

(b) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(c) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (c), the Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”;

(B) by striking “subsections (a) and (c)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

(d) Section 6003 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 579c), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(e) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579d), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(f) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579c-1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(g) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579d-1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(h) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579c-2), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

**TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES
INFRASTRUCTURE**

SEC. 401. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other pur-

poses, as identified in the reports titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Con-

gress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports or decision documents designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AK	Port of Nome Modifications	May 29, 2020	Federal: \$368,173,000 Non-Federal: \$122,746,000 Total: \$490,919,000
2. AK	Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) Channels	February 7, 2020	Federal: \$26,202,750 Non-Federal: \$8,734,250 Total: \$34,937,000
3. CT	New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project	May 7, 2020	Federal: \$53,489,000 Non-Federal: \$18,822,000 Total: \$72,311,000
4. NY, NJ	New York and New Jersey Harbor Anchorages	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$18,940,000 Non-Federal: \$6,310,000 Total: \$25,250,000
5. TX	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River Floodgates and Colorado River Locks	October 23, 2019	Total: \$409,777,000, to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.
6. TX	Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$462,803,000 Non-Federal: \$414,045,000 Total: \$876,848,000
7. TX	Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca	November 15, 2019	Federal: \$138,660,000 Non-Federal: \$79,664,000 Total: \$218,324,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AZ	Little Colorado River at Winslow, Navajo County	December 14, 2018	Federal: \$52,462,000 Non-Federal: \$28,249,000 Total: \$80,711,000
2. CA	Westminster, East Garden Grove, California Flood Risk Management	July 9, 2020	Federal: \$314,506,000 Non-Federal: \$910,092,000 Total: \$1,224,598,000
3. CT, NY	Westchester County Streams, Byram River Basin, Fairfield County, Connecticut, and Westchester County, New York	May 7, 2020	Federal: \$14,702,500 Non-Federal: \$14,702,500 Total: \$29,405,000
4. ND	Souris River Basin Flood Risk Management	April 16, 2019	Federal: \$58,041,750 Non-Federal: \$31,253,250 Total: \$89,295,000
5. NJ	Peckman River Basin	April 29, 2020	Federal: \$95,022,000 Non-Federal: \$51,166,000 Total: \$146,188,000
6. NM	Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection, Bernalillo to Belen	March 13, 2020	Federal: \$190,538,000 Non-Federal: \$102,598,000 Total: \$293,136,000
7. OK	Tulsa and West-Tulsa Levee System, Tulsa County	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$86,780,000 Non-Federal: \$46,728,000 Total: \$133,508,000

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. DE	Delaware Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River	March 6, 2020	Initial Federal: \$53,220,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$28,660,000 Total: \$81,880,000 Renourishment Federal: \$116,380,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$116,380,000 Renourishment Total: \$232,760,000
2. NJ	New Jersey Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River	April 8, 2020	Initial Federal: \$80,780,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$43,500,000 Total: \$124,280,000 Renourishment Federal: \$82,140,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$82,140,000 Renourishment Total: \$164,280,000
3. NJ	Rahway River Basin, New Jersey Coastal Storm Risk Management	June 9, 2020	Federal: \$46,754,000 Non-Federal: \$25,175,000 Total: \$71,929,000
4. NY	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, Atlantic Coast of New York	August 22, 2019	Initial Federal: \$604,203,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$604,203,000 Renourishment Federal: \$189,763,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$189,763,000 Renourishment Total: \$379,526,000
5. NY	Hashamomuck Cove Coastal Storm Risk Management	December 9, 2019	Initial Federal: \$11,549,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$6,218,000 Total: \$17,767,000 Renourishment Federal: \$23,481,500 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$23,481,500 Renourishment Total: \$46,963,000
6. RI	Pawcatuck River Coastal Storm Risk Management Project	December 19, 2018	Federal: \$37,848,000 Non-Federal: \$20,379,000 Total: \$58,227,000
7. VA	Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management	February 5, 2019	Federal: \$909,040,000 Non-Federal: \$489,480,000 Total: \$1,398,520,000

(4) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECO-SYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CO	South Platte River and Tributaries, Adams and Denver Counties	July 29, 2019	Federal: \$334,412,000 Non-Federal: \$200,406,000 Total: \$534,818,000
2. NY	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York Reformulation	July 9, 2020	Initial Federal: \$1,541,981,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$1,541,981,000 Renourishment Federal: \$742,926,500 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$742,926,500 Renourishment Total: \$1,485,853,000

(5) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CA	Delta Islands and Levees	December 18, 2018	Federal: \$16,746,395 Non-Federal: \$9,016,736 Total: \$25,763,131
2. CA	Yuba River Ecosystem Restoration	June 20, 2019	Federal: \$65,014,326 Non-Federal: \$35,008,268 Total: \$100,022,594
3. FL	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Loxahatchee River Watershed Restoration Project, Martin and Palm Beach Counties	April 8, 2020	Federal: \$372,232,000 Non-Federal: \$368,528,000 Total: \$740,760,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
4. IL	The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study - Brandon Road, Will County	May 23, 2019	Federal: \$690,643,200 Non-Federal: \$172,660,800 Total: \$863,304,000
5. IL	South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Bubbly Creek, Ecosystem Restoration	July 9, 2020	Federal: \$11,657,000 Non-Federal: \$6,277,000 Total: \$17,934,000
6. MD	Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County	December 19, 2018	Federal: \$23,171,000 Non-Federal: \$12,476,000 Total: \$35,647,000
7. MO	St. Louis Riverfront- Meramec River Basin Ecosystem Restoration	November 1, 2019	Federal: \$60,124,000 Non-Federal: \$32,375,000 Total: \$92,499,000
8. NM	Rio Grande, Environmental Management Program, Sandia Pueblo to Isleta Pueblo, New Mexico Ecosystem Restoration	August 5, 2019	Federal: \$16,163,000 Non-Federal: \$8,703,000 Total: \$24,866,000
9. NY, NJ	Hudson-Raritan Estuary Ecosystem Restoration	May 26, 2020	Federal: \$265,320,000 Non-Federal: \$142,864,000 Total: \$408,184,000
10. TX	Jefferson County Ecosystem Restoration	September 12, 2019	Federal: \$37,615,000 Non-Federal: \$20,254,000 Total: \$57,869,000

(6) WATER SUPPLY.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. OR	Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation,	December 18, 2019	Federal: \$0 Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$0

(7) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. FL	Caloosahatchee River West Basin Storage Reservoir (C-43 WBSR)	July 24, 2020	Federal: \$503,466,500 Non-Federal: \$503,466,500 Total: \$1,006,933,000
2. KY	Kentucky Lock	June 9, 2020	Total: \$1,152,769,000 (to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund)
3. NC	Carolina Beach Integrated Beach Renourishment	June 16, 2020	Federal: \$24,205,000 Non-Federal: \$24,205,000 Total: \$48,410,000
4. NC	Wrightsville Beach	July 2, 2020	Federal: \$53,788,000 Non-Federal: \$22,329,000 Total: \$76,117,000 Renourishment Federal: \$14,553,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$14,553,000 Renourishment Total: \$29,106,000
5. TX	Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Deepening and Widening and Barge Shelves	May 4, 2020	Federal: \$403,000,000 Non-Federal: \$273,010,000 Total: \$676,010,000

SEC. 402. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for ecosystem restoration, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the

Chief of Engineers, dated May 23, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Federal share of the cost of construction shall be 80 percent.

(2) The Secretary may include the addition or substitution of technologies or measures not described in the report, as the Secretary determines to be advisable.

(b) WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW REALLOCATION STUDY.—The Secretary shall

carry out the project for water supply, Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation, Oregon, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 18, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Secretary shall meet the obligations of the Corps of Engineers under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by complying

with the June 2019 NMFS Willamette Basin Review Study Biological Opinion Reasonable and Prudent Alternative until such time, if any, as it is modified or replaced, in whole or in part, through the consultation process under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(2) The Secretary may reallocate not more than 10 percent of overall storage in the joint conservation pool, as authorized by this Act and without further congressional action, if such reallocation is consistent with the ongoing consultation under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 related to Willamette Valley System operations.

(3) The Secretary shall ensure that the revised reallocation is not reallocated from a single storage use, does not seriously affect authorized project purposes, and does not otherwise involve major operational changes to the project.

(c) CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—Section 5127 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1242) is amended by striking “\$150,000,000” and inserting “\$232,430,000”.

SEC. 403. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS BASED ON FEASIBILITY STUDIES PREPARED BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, subject to subsection (b):

(1) FORT PIERCE, ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Fort Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of St. Lucie County, Florida Port Pierce Shore Protection Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of \$33,107,639, and at an estimated total cost of \$97,958,972 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project.

(2) BAPTISTE COLLETTE BAYOU, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Baptiste Collette Bayou, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Plaquemines Parish Government’s Section 203 Study Baptiste Collette Bayou Navigation Channel Deepening Project Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (January 2017, Amended April 2018)” and dated June 2018, at a total cost of \$44,920,000.

(3) HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Houma Navigation Canal, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Houma Navigation Canal Deepening Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of \$253,458,000.

(4) PORT FOURCHON BELLE PASS CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel Deepening Project Section 203 Feasibility Study (January 2019, revised January 2020)” and dated April 2020, at a total cost of \$95,483,000.

(5) WILMINGTON HARBOR, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina Navigation Improvement Project Integrated Section 203 Study & Environmental Report (February 2020)” and dated May 2020, at a total cost of \$834,093,000.

(6) CHACON CREEK, TEXAS.—The project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and other purposes, Chacon Creek, Texas, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Chacon Creek, Texas Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Assessment (August 2018)” and dated September 2018, at a total cost of \$51,973,000.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may only carry out a project authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) substantially in accordance with the applicable review assessment for the project submitted by the Secretary under section 203(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as identified in subsection (a) of this section, and subject to such modifications or conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and identifies in a final assessment that addresses the concerns, recommendations, and conditions identified by the Secretary in the applicable review assessment; and

(2) after the Secretary transmits to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate such final assessment.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(c)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a report” and inserting “an assessment”.

TITLE V—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 501. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7575, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we continue the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee tradition by considering the fourth consecutive bipartisan Water Resources Development Act since 2014, a tradition started by my friend and predecessor, Bill Shuster. It is a great tradition, and it is an incredible service to our Nation.

I am proud to be joined by Ranking Member SAM GRAVES, Subcommittee

Chair NAPOLITANO, and Subcommittee Ranking Member BRUCE WESTERMAN in sponsoring the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

The bill under consideration today was developed in a bipartisan manner with input from both sides of the aisle. The legislation was considered in committee and favorably reported by voice vote.

H.R. 7575 includes projects and policy provisions that impact communities across the Nation. It authorizes construction of 34 projects studied and approved by the chief of engineers since WRDA 2018 was signed into law.

It authorizes 36 new Corps of Engineers feasibility studies and directs the Corps to expedite the completion of 41 ongoing studies, which were submitted to the Corps by local sponsors willing to share the costs of these project studies.

H.R. 7575 continues our work to ensure the full utilization of the harbor maintenance trust fund by unlocking nearly \$10 billion. This is \$10 billion under an initiative started by Ronald Reagan of taxes collected from shippers that are ultimately paid by consumers in the United States. So, for years, we have been taking money under false pretenses and not spending that money on its designated purpose.

This bill will finally rectify that problem. There is ample need to invest that \$10 billion in our ports and harbors around the country.

The legislation also directs the Secretary of the Army to equitably allocate maintenance funds to pay for harbor operation maintenance needs, while addressing the ongoing needs of the Nation’s largest ports, the Great Lakes harbors, its emerging harbors.

This is especially important in communities like my district along Oregon’s southwest coast, where the difference between life and death for those who both recreate or fish commercially is in the conditions of our harbors, jetties, and breakwaters. It is literally life and death in very cold water. So, this is incredibly important.

Before earmarks were banned, I used to get my harbors dredged by earmarking. Since that was banned when the Republicans took over in 2010, I managed in the first WRDA bill in 2014 to get a 10 percent set-aside for small and emerging harbors. That has provided the critical dredging for my district and many, many harbors around the United States of America.

This bill, because we will have a lot more money, will provide actually 20 percent to small and emerging harbors. We have delayed and deferred projects all around the country.

This bill also recognizes the important role that inland waterways play in our Nation and provides a cost-share shift to help in completing construction of much-needed projects. I would give a shout-out to CONOR LAMB from Pennsylvania as being a tireless advocate on that, as well as other Members.

WRDA 2020 also includes specific policies that focus on climate change,

natural infrastructure solutions, and affordability, and provisions that assist minority, Tribal, and rural communities.

The bill recognizes the important role of resiliency in helping communities meet the current and future challenges of changing hydrologic conditions and repetitive and more frequent flooding events. I am glad to include provisions in this bill that will ensure taxpayer dollars are spent on infrastructure that will be resilient and will contribute to the resiliency of communities across the country.

It also ensures that all communities, especially communities with socioeconomic challenges, have a path forward in getting the tools they need for flood protection and ecosystem restoration. H.R. 7575 continues this tradition with a 2-year extension of the process.

We accommodated many, many Member requests from both sides of the aisle in this bill. There are some provisions in this bill, however, that will need further review. This legislation continues in conference.

For example, H.R. 7575 authorizes six projects where the studies were developed by the non-Federal interest under section 203 of WRDA-86.

The committee has received letters of concern about whether these projects have undergone sufficient environmental review, which would include public input of an equivalent level to studies developed by the Corps of Engineers. These are valid questions, and they may require changes to the 203 process as we go to conference with the Senate.

I would like to recognize a few individual members on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their valuable contributions to this bill: Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, for her dogged support in addressing the maintenance needs of our largest ports, particularly southern California, and for meeting future water supply needs of arid regions around the Nation, and the dedication of some of the newest members of my committee.

The vice chairwoman of the subcommittee is Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL from Florida, and her dedication to getting provisions to protect and restore the national treasure that is the Everglades was tireless.

I also recognize the work of the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) for her incredibly strong advocacy for the Port of Houston and their needs, and for the protection and sustainability of the businesses and communities along the Texas Gulf Coast that depend upon that navigable area.

I also recognize the new Member, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER), for her advocacy in addressing flooding risks of rural and economically disadvantaged communities within the Mississippi River Valley.

As I mentioned before, CONOR LAMB contributed. ANGIE CRAIG, Mr. PAPPAS from New Hampshire, Representative

DELGADO, HARLEY ROUDA, and SHARICE DAVIDS, they were all instrumental in bringing important issues to the committee and contributed to the formation of WRDA 2020.

The Water Resources Development Act is essential to communities throughout the country that depend upon the safe and affordable uses of their ports, harbors, and inland waterways. Our economy, safety, and environment will benefit from passage of WRDA 2020.

I am proud of our work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. H.R. 7575 contains provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Budget takes this action with the mutual understanding that, in doing so, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation or similar legislation and requests your support if such a request is made.

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2020.

Hon. JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. YARMUTH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I appreciate your decision to waive formal consideration of the bill.

I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I further agree that by forgoing formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving any jurisdiction over any relevant subject matter. Additionally, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on the Budget should a House-Senate conference be convened on this legislation. Finally, this exchange of letters will be included in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the floor.

Thank you again and I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the

Committee on the Budget on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, or WRDA 2020.

Two weeks ago, we advanced this bipartisan legislation out of committee by voice vote. In taking up this bill, as the chairman pointed out, we are maintaining Congress' consideration of WRDA legislation on a 2-year cycle, something that we have done for some time now, since 2014.

We are also demonstrating that when we work in partnership instead of partisanship, we can accomplish great things for the infrastructure and for the American people.

I want to thank all the members of the committee and staff, especially the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, for their hard work and their willingness to work together on this important piece of legislation.

WRDA authorizes 39 critical projects across the country that originate at the local level but provide far-reaching benefits throughout their regions and the national economy.

WRDA is going to strengthen our American competitiveness. It is going to provide greater safeguards and peace of mind to our constituencies and help create jobs. Importantly, this bill supports the Nation's inland waterway networks and flood protection infrastructure.

In my home State of Missouri, we experienced devastating high water in 2019. RECORD flooding along the Missouri River destroyed homes, farms, and businesses in communities like Big Lake and Craig, Missouri, and many of those affected are still recovering to this day.

The threat of flooding remains for many Americans, and this bill authorizes some bold new plans to evaluate flood risk reduction in many of the major river basins.

This is a good first step to providing greater protections for the lives and property of the folks in the Lower Missouri River Basin. My district also borders the Mississippi River, with local communities facing very similar challenges with flood control and navigation.

To address these issues, WRDA provides new authority for the construction of permanent flood control structures in communities that experience repetitive losses as a result of flood events. We simply have to stop rebuilding back to the same inadequate standards in repeatedly flooded communities like mine in north Missouri.

This bill also streamlines the Public Law 84-99 program to ensure critical projects under this program can be done more efficiently and more effectively.

It has been more than a year since floods devastated parts of my district, and I am still getting calls from levee districts and communities on both the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers about issues they are having with this program. Under this bill, some of that is going to be alleviated.

The bill also delays construction and requires further evaluation of interception-rearing complexes, or IRCs. These expensive and unproven projects are supposedly designed to save the pallid sturgeon, but we don't know if they will actually do that. What we do know is that they are disastrous for navigation and disastrous for flood control along the Missouri River.

This bill recognizes the Corps should not build any more IRCs until it is proven that they won't negatively impact navigation and flood protection for many of our towns, farms, and businesses along the river.

Additionally, this legislation provides important new tools and funding set-asides for rural communities. It ensures that major construction and rehabilitation efforts on the inland waterway system are completed more quickly, and it offsets new project authorizations with deauthorizations of old, out-of-date projects to ensure fiscal responsibility.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, and I want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Chairwoman NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member WESTERMAN for their partnership in this bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 7575, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act.

This bill, which was artfully and carefully drafted by Chairman DEFAZIO and the chair of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, enjoys broad bipartisan support.

In particular, this bill includes provisions that will protect the Great Lakes, which contain 90 percent of North America's fresh surface water.

It includes a specific authorization of the invasive species control system at Brandon Road Lock and Dam. Once completed, Brandon Road will prevent Asian carp and other invasive species from entering the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes delegation has fought for that authorization for nearly a decade. Since 2010, when Congress authorized the Great Lakes interbasin study, our delegation has worked for a long-term and basin-wide solution to the threat posed by the Asian carp.

Today's authorization is not the end, but it sends a bipartisan and clear message to our Nation that we take the protection of America's greatest \$7 billion recreational, fishery, and freshwater system seriously.

In addition to the bill's commitment to the Brandon Road project, I also

commend the committee and its chair for taking important steps updating requirements for resiliency, embedding beneficial reuse into the Corps' project development process, and investing and rebuilding the Nation's water infrastructure for the 21st century, all of which will create good jobs across this Nation.

Let me applaud Chairman DEFAZIO and the ranking member for their careful work to develop a bipartisan bill. The Water Resources Development Act of 2020 enjoys broad support and will ensure our Nation's continued prosperity.

□ 1430

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), who is on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican leader and our ranking member, Mr. GRAVES from Missouri, for their continued leadership on the consideration of the Water Resource Development Acts, or WRDAs.

Today I rise in strong support of H.R. 7575, WRDA 2020. H.R. 7575 strengthens our Nation's ability to withstand severe weather and flood events. It authorizes the construction of key water infrastructure projects, creates jobs here at home, and directly contributes to our economic growth and competitiveness.

The Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, where I have the honor of serving as ranking member, has jurisdiction over the water resources development missions of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. H.R. 7575 authorizes vital Corps projects for navigation; flood control; shoreline protection; recreation; water supply; environmental protection, restoration, and enhancement; and fish and wildlife management.

This WRDA bill focuses on supporting more resilient infrastructure, increasing rural flood protection, addressing the maintenance backlogs at our Nation's ports and harbors, and prioritizes our Nation's inland waterways.

This bill will help key projects in my home State of Arkansas that will spur economic development and prevent further environmental degradation. It advances the long-stalled MKARNS deepening project, protects the water supply for users of the Ouachita-Black system, and begins the process of preventing bank destabilization of the Sulphur River.

Our committee passed this bill 2 weeks ago by a voice vote, continuing the strong bipartisan support and the WRDA tradition.

H.R. 7575 is fiscally responsible, with new project authorizations fully offset by deauthorizations of projects that are outdated or no longer viable.

Above all, this legislation represents the continued bipartisan commitment

to regular order for consideration of water resources projects. Regularly overseeing the improvement of our Nation's infrastructure is one of Congress' most important responsibilities.

This is a good, commonsense bill, and I want to thank Chair DEFAZIO and especially Chair NAPOLITANO for her leadership on our Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and both of them for working across the aisle with us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the incredible staff work on both sides of the aisle, but, in particular, the Republican staff, which includes Ian Bennitt, Jon Pawlow, and Victor Sarmiento. I also want to recognize Jefferson Deming on my staff for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 7575.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I included in the RECORD a letter from Chairman JOHN YARMUTH from the House Committee on the Budget agreeing to waive consideration of H.R. 7575, as amended, as well as my response to Chairman YARMUTH expressing appreciation for his willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD several letters of support from organizations and stakeholders in support of H.R. 7575.

JULY 28, 2020.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

The farmers, ranchers, food and beverage manufacturers, processors, package suppliers and agricultural product marketers that comprise our memberships are dedicated to providing the safe, abundant and affordable food, fiber and feed required to ensure our country stays healthy and fed.

Because American agriculture's competitive advantage largely depends upon the quality, reliability, accessibility and cost-effectiveness of the national transportation system, our organizations commend Congress for consistently examining water infrastructure projects every two years and write today to urge your support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2020.

As you know, agricultural commodities move via truck, rail, barge and ocean-going vessels. Consistent and timely focus on the U.S. inland waterways transportation network is vital to agricultural stakeholders because 20 percent of a farmer's income depends on exports. Inland waterway barge transportation is the least expensive, most efficient and most environmentally friendly mode, and U.S. locks and dams help relieve congestion and wear-and-tear on highways as well as discipline rail rates.

With respect to U.S. port and inland waterways infrastructure, H.R. 7575 includes two notable provisions we wish to highlight. Both Section 101 concerning the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) and Section 108 pertaining to inland waterways projects would positively affect the ability of our organizations' members to fulfill their role in the agricultural value chain to serve American farmers and domestic and global customers.

As you know, the intent of Section 101 of H.R. 7575 is to "unlock" the more than \$9 billion that's been collected and deposited in the HMTF by those that pay the 0.125 percent ad valorem tax based upon the value of

cargo imports. The inability thus far to access and spend those dollars on much-needed port dredging further has eroded the United States' comparative transportation advantage and contributed to lost export opportunities to the detriment of U.S. economic growth. Our organizations strongly support Section 101, which would provide critical and overdue access to the existing balance in the HMTF so that these funds can be spent on dredging as intended.

In addition, we believe that adjusting the cost-share formula for inland waterway construction and major rehabilitation of navigation projects, as proposed in Section 108 of H.R. 7575, is a prudent policy that would help address a critical problem facing our inland waterways transportation system. As you know, the majority of U.S. locks and dams are operating on borrowed time, having long outlived their 50-year design life. Further, most are not of sufficient capacity to handle modern 1,200-foot barge tows, and others require more maintenance. Each of these factors costs shippers valuable time and resources.

Section 108 amends the cost-share formula for the construction and major rehabilitation of each inland waterways navigation project from the current 50 percent general revenue and 50 percent Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) funding to 65 percent general revenue and 35 percent IWTF. The policy is a step in the right direction that would expedite completion of such projects and help bring the U.S. inland waterways transportation system into the 21st century. For these reasons, we support making permanent the cost share formula adjustment in H.R. 7575 to provide certainty for these projects, which reduces construction costs.

Our organizations strongly support passage of H.R. 7575 because Section 101 and Section 108 would enhance U.S. agriculture's competitiveness, contribute to the overall efficiency of the U.S. transportation system, and promote overall U.S. economic growth and job creation. We urge you to support and approve this critical infrastructure bill so that negotiations can proceed with the Senate with the goal of enacting a new WRDA law in 2020.

Sincerely,

Agricultural and Food Transporters Conference, Agricultural Retailers Association, Agriculture Transportation Coalition, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, American Sugar Cane League, Corn Refiners Association, Farm Credit Council, Florida Sugar Cane League, Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, National Aquaculture Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Grain and Feed Association, National Milk Producers Federation, National Oilseed Processors Association, North American Millers' Association, North American Renderers Association, Specialty Soya & Grains Alliance, The Fertilizer Institute, United Fresh Produce Association, USA Rice, Waterways Council, Inc., Western Growers.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF PORT AUTHORITIES,
July 15, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Re Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFazio AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The American Association

of Port Authorities (AAPA) supports passage of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 through the House of Representatives. On behalf of our 78 United States member ports, AAPA appreciates that this legislation expands the budget cap adjustment to all the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund revenues for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) which would unlock approximately \$10 billion from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. We are pleased to see that the legislation recognizes the needs of donor ports, emerging harbors and Great Lakes navigation projects and look forward to working with you prior to enactment on these provisions.

The legislation also authorizes new navigation channel improvement studies as well as authorizing projects to proceed to construction. The legislation continues to improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of Corps study efforts and product delivery. These efforts are essential for our Nation's future economic growth as well as providing family supporting jobs.

I thank you for your work on these issues and others related to maritime infrastructure, both included in this bill and otherwise. Our Association looks forward to working with you, your Committee staff, and the rest of Congress on passage of this legislation.

Respectfully,
CHRISTOPHER J. CONNOR,
President and CEO.

THE CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION,
July 28, 2020.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Minority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Re H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC)—the leading association in the construction industry representing more than 27,000 firms, including America's leading general contractors, specialty-contracting firms, service providers, and suppliers—I urge you to vote "yes" on H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, which is expected to be considered by the U.S. House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules this week.

H.R. 7575 is an essential step forward as Congress works to continue the biennial process of passing legislation that invests in our nation's water resources infrastructure. The predictability of the biennial passage of water resources development acts is critical for all stakeholders involved in the planning and execution of water resources projects. Through these investments, H.R. 7575 will create jobs, improve the quality of life for all Americans, protect our communities, facilitate waterborne commerce, restore environmentally sensitive areas of the country, and help grow our economy.

AGC appreciates that the bill will help ensure that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Civil Works Program is appropriately responsive to the water resources needs identified by local communities. Specifically, the bill authorizes more than 30 pending Corps Chief's Reports, which will facilitate important water resources projects across the country, authorizes dozens of new feasibility studies, and expedites the completion of many existing feasibility studies. In addition, AGC supports the provisions of H.R. 7575 that ensure funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund go towards their intended uses, extend a pilot program that al-

lows non-federal interests to carry out feasibility studies and projects, and modify the cost share of projects funded by the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, among others.

AGC applauds the bipartisan process used to develop H.R. 7575 and is hopeful that the House and U.S. Senate will reach an agreement between their respective legislative proposals this year. Again, AGC urges you to vote "yes" on H.R. 7575 and looks forward to working with the Congress as the legislative process continues.

Sincerely,
JAMES V. CHRISTIANSON,
Vice President, Government Relations.

THE PORT
OF LOS ANGELES,
July 16, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFazio, CHAIRWOMAN NAPOLITANO, RANKING MEMBER GRAVES, AND RANKING MEMBER WESTERMAN: On behalf of the Port of Los Angeles, I am writing to thank you for your leadership in advancing the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 and to express our strong support for its swift enactment.

Combined, the San Pedro Bay ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach handle more than one third of the nation's containerized imports and exports. In fact, every single Congressional district in the nation is reached by the goods moving through the San Pedro bay, so maintaining the in-water infrastructure at these ports is essential for American competitiveness in the global economy.

In previous communications we noted that historically the San Pedro Bay ports receive a disproportionately low return of Harbor Maintenance Trust (HMT) revenues, and what we do receive cannot be used for vital infrastructure maintenance. We are grateful that you have recognized the importance of equity for donor ports in your legislation and addressed these priorities:

Fair share of HMT funding for donor ports.

Expanded uses for emerging harbors and donor ports.

Extension of the 2106 program for donor and energy transfer ports.

A robust and healthy port industry is vital to our nation's economy. Donor ports, such as the Port of Los Angeles, play a fundamental role in supporting the national freight system and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Full spend of HMT revenues (including the trust fund balance), and fair and equitable allocations, will ensure that this important funding is used to enhance our nation's competitiveness.

Language in the recently passed CARES Act includes "full-spend" to be implemented with either the passage of WRDA reauthorization or in January 2021. This makes addressing donor equity and expanded uses extremely urgent and I am grateful for your work to address these vital issues and am happy to express my strong support for this bi-partisan legislation.

We applaud your efforts to address this vital infrastructure need and hope to work

with you as this bill moves forward to address the unique requirements of our nation's ports.

Sincerely,

EUGENE D. SEROKA,
Executive Director.

[From the National Wildlife Federation,
July 15, 2020]

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT
INCLUDES WINS FOR WILDLIFE, COMMUNITIES**

WASHINGTON, DC—The Water Resources Development Act of 2020, which is being marked up by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, includes numerous provisions to advance ecosystem restoration and strengthen climate resilience. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out a related bill, America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2020, earlier this year.

"Nature has long been an underutilized tool in the Army Corps' toolbox. This bill takes important steps to remedy this, with a suite of reforms that remove barriers to using healthy rivers, floodplains, wetlands and shorelines to protect communities from hurricanes and floods," said Melissa Samet, senior water resources counsel at the National Wildlife Federation. "The National Wildlife Federation is grateful for the strong leadership of Chairman DeFazio, Subcommittee Chair Napolitano, Ranking Member Sam Graves and Subcommittee Ranking Member Westerman for their bipartisan efforts to advance important provisions to protect frontline communities and vital ecosystems including the Everglades, Mississippi River Delta, and Great Lakes."

The National Wildlife Federation supports many important provisions of this bill, including:

Provisions that remove barriers to, and drive use of natural infrastructure, including by ensuring that natural infrastructure solutions will benefit from the same cost-share requirements as non-structural measures.

Careful evaluation of natural infrastructure solutions to protect communities from storms and floods, including a robust pilot program that provides full federal funding for flood and storm risk reduction studies for economically disadvantaged communities and ensures robust evaluation of natural infrastructure solutions.

Implementation of the Water Resources Principles, Requirements and Guidelines (PR&G) by the Corps, including fully engaging the public in that effort. Effective implementation of the PR&G will bring the Corps' water resources planning process in line with 21st Century water resources management principles, and improve water resources planning across the board.

Comprehensive review of the Corps' mitigation record by the Government Accountability Office. Ensuring full compliance with mitigation requirements is critical for fish and wildlife and for the communities and economies that rely on these vital resources.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
July 14, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce applauds the bipartisan approach taken by your Committee in advance of tomorrow's markup of the Water Resources

Development Act (WRDA) of 2020. Reauthorization of America's water resources programs is critical to economic growth and environmental stewardship, and we support this legislation.

WRDA would ensure the viability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works programs including navigation, flood risk management, recreation, and associated environmental infrastructure. Enactment of this bill would provide critical economic and environmental benefits to the United States.

Reauthorizing these programs prior to their September 30 expiration would provide the certainty of federal commitment needed to allow state, local, and private partners to move forward with needed planning and construction of modern, resilient infrastructure. These important water projects would bring economic benefits to both rural and urban regions.

The Chamber also applauds the inclusion of 34 new project authorizations, additional provisions to ensure modern, resilient infrastructure, improvements in water supply delivery, and increased investment from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, a long-time priority of both your Committee and the Chamber.

With less than three months until the current authorization expires, the Chamber is pleased that House leadership anticipates floor consideration of the bill later this month. We appreciate your Committee moving promptly to ensure timely action on these critical issues.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

WATERWAYS COUNCIL, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The members of Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI) thank you for your leadership and commitment to the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) biennial process.

America's inland waterways system includes 12,000 miles of commercially operated and maintained navigable channels that directly affect 38 states. The inland waterways system is tasked with transporting the nation's bulk commodities that keep America competitive in the most energy-efficient and environmentally friendly way. In 2016, 558 million tons of commodities valued at \$300 billion transited the waterways, supporting 541,000 American jobs.

WCI thanks you for Section 108. This section adjusts the cost-share formula for the construction and major rehabilitation of inland waterways navigation projects from the current 50 percent general revenue and 50 percent Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) to 65 percent general revenue and 35 percent IWTF for seven years. The policy is a step in the right direction and will help expedite the completion of inland waterways construction and major rehabilitation projects during the applicable years. WCI looks forward to working with the Committee as they proceed to conference on making the cost-share permanent.

Passing this legislation in regular order is critical to ensuring waterways reliability in order to keep America competitive. WCI offers its support of passing WRDA 2020.

Sincerely,

TRACY ZEA,
*President and CEO,
Waterways Council, Inc.*

WRDA 2020 SUPPORT LIST

American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Agricultural Working Group, American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), American Society of Civil Engineers, Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), Association of California Water Agencies, Association of Marina Industries, BOAT US, Earthjustice, Future Ports, Great Lakes Metro Chambers Coalition (GLMCC), Healing Our Waters-Great Lakes Coalition, Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), Lake Carriers' Association, Marine Retailers Association of America.

National Association of Counties (NACo), National Audubon Society, National Grain and Feed Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), National Water Supply Alliance, National Wildlife Federation (NWF), Port of Los Angeles, Resources Legacy Fund/Open Rivers Fund, Rise to Resilience and Waterfront Alliance, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Waterways Council, Inc.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCIA), who is a member of the committee.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 and commend the leadership of Chairman DEFAZIO and Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment Chair NAPOLITANO.

I hail from Chicago and the Nation's Gold Coast along Lake Michigan, and we know how important a healthy Great Lakes system is. Lake Michigan is not only Chicago's primary drinking water source, it is part of the largest freshwater source in the world—our beloved Great Lakes.

Lake Michigan is a tremendous recreational resource and economic asset, and it needs to be protected. This legislation authorizes projects important to my constituents.

First, the Brandon Road Lock and Dam project must be completed to prevent Asian carp, an invasive species, from migrating into Lake Michigan.

We must also restore Bubbly Creek, a degraded waterway that was polluted by Chicago's meatpacking industry in the early 1900s and made famous by Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle." Restoring the waterway will create a healthy ecosystem and benefit neighborhoods like McKinley Park, Bridgeport, and Pilsen.

Managing storm water systems can be challenging in Chicago because it is heavily urbanized. This bill promotes more natural infrastructure and studies for Chicago area rivers and the Great Lakes river basins to make sure future projects preserve our drinking water, protect people's homes and businesses from flooding, and restore our environment so that all communities benefit from our rivers and Great Lakes.

I am proud of the bipartisan effort developing and passing this legislation through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

I also want to give a shout-out to my incredible Brookings Institution fellow, Christine Gallagher, who has done tremendous work for my office on transportation and water issues. This is her last week before she returns to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and I congratulate her.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise also, today, in support of the Water Resources and Development Act of 2020. This piece of legislation is a top priority for my constituents in south Florida on the Treasure Coast because it is critical to our public health, our environment, and our economy.

Now, I am smiling because this legislation includes a number of provisions that I was proud to write to protect Florida's waterways, including accelerating construction of the EAA reservoir, reducing discharges from Lake Okeechobee to the St. Lucie Estuary, and to combat harmful algal blooms—all yeomen's work.

Now, demanding that the Army Corps of Engineers must seek to reduce discharges into our coastal estuaries is a huge victory that everybody in our community should be proud of.

However, I ask my colleagues this: If their constituents were being, literally, poisoned by the Federal Government, would they fight for anything less than a complete stop to that poisoning?

That is why I am going to continue to be in this fight with everything that I have got, build on this momentum to eliminate all toxic discharges into my community and send more water south into Florida's Everglades.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), who is a member of the committee and who was key in getting the additional investments in the inland waterways.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, others before me have said why it matters that we have working locks and dams. It has always mattered.

The United States has more miles of navigable rivers, lakes, and canals than anywhere else in the world. It made us who we are as a nation. We could move iron ore to make steel faster, cheaper, and easier than all of our competitors because of our water, but especially because of our locks and dams that control the water. So we need to fix them, and this bill will help.

I hope that America will take note of something else here today, which is that this Congress still works. It might not be as well as people would want every single day, but this is a major bill. This is a major infrastructure bill, and this is a major infrastructure bill that has been bipartisan from the very beginning and, hopefully, will end bipartisan when our friends in the Senate work with us to get this done.

I want to give a special thanks to my Republican friend and colleague from

Texas (Mr. BABIN). Together, we led a big group of Members from both parties in support of a better way to fund these locks and dams.

I especially want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES, who agreed. Now we have a better chance to rebuild the locks and dams and to deliver on the promise we made to the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend Republicans and Democrats for coming together. This bill is a bipartisan bill. It doesn't mean it is perfect, but it means that we all came together and we worked together to ensure that we are advancing our Nation's water resources.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does everything from ecological restoration, to our navigation channels, to flood control, to hurricane protection.

This is about the resilience and sustainability of our community and the resilience and sustainability of our ecosystem and our economy. These are projects that we need to be working together on.

I want to thank my friend, the chairman, Mr. DEFAZIO; the ranking member, SAM GRAVES; as well as the subcommittee—friends—chairman and ranking member, GRACE NAPOLITANO and BRUCE WESTERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, this bill advances important priorities like ensuring section 1043 can be expanded to allow our State and non-Federal sponsors to be a partner with the Corps of Engineers—a true partner—and lead some sections of the projects; allowing our continuing authorities programs to be expanded; incorporating tools like natural infrastructure into the toolbox of achieving these objectives that we all share; ensuring that we attack—and I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. MAST) for leading on this—the harmful algal blooms off the coast of Louisiana, which I represent, largest dead zone in this Nation on a national basis; and importantly, ensuring that we maintain and take a different sustainable approach to the authorized depth of the Mississippi River system, which is America's commerce superhighway, connecting 31 States with the least expensive and lowest emissions form of transportation; putting shipments on barges and on oceangoing vessels so America can compete globally with the great products that we develop here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the great staff who worked on this, including Ian Bennett, Victor Sarmiento, Ryan Seiger, Maggie Ayrea, Paul Sawyer, and all the folks who helped put this bill together. I urge adoption.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Development Act contains

important language to help prevent a public health crisis at the Salton Sea, California's largest lake, which is in my district.

The Salton Sea's shoreline is rapidly receding, exposing thousands of acres of lake bed and sending dust loaded with selenium and pesticides into the air and into the lungs of residents in my district.

My provision will authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to take the next steps and study the construction of a northern perimeter lake project at the sea, which is the next major project under the State of California's Salton Sea Management Program, and it will strengthen the Federal-State partnership.

Later this week, we will pass the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, which contains another one of my provisions which will prioritize the Army Corps' efforts at the Salton Sea.

I would like to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Congressman VARGAS, and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO for their partnership on this pressing and important issue, and I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), who is the ranking member on the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES for his leadership on this issue and also the ranking member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, a good friend, Mr. WESTERMAN, along with Chairman DEFAZIO and Chair NAPOLITANO of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

This is a great day. This is a continuation of what was started in 2014 under Chairman Shuster at the time, and it was with bipartisan success that we began getting the water resource development bills passed on a 2-year basis. This is another shining example of what bipartisan work can do. We are here to talk about the successes of authorizing all of the Corps of Engineers' programs, which is extremely important to my district, which is surrounded by the inland waterway system.

If we don't do our job in this institution in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to pass a Water Resources Development Act on a biannual basis, then what happens is we put the effectiveness of our farmers and our manufacturers from getting their products from their manufacturing facilities or their fields into the inland waterway system and out into the global marketplace in a cost-effective way and in a way that is going to allow them to continue to provide jobs in my district.

One aspect of this bill I am particularly grateful for is the cost share adjustment in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This is a big deal for us to

upgrade our antiquated lock and dam system along the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. This is a success story.

I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES. I do also want to thank the staff of the Transportation and Infrastructure committee. They worked hard. All of them deserve a round of thanks, and I appreciate the efforts on not just this bill, but every other piece of legislation that goes through that great committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and I am glad to see the process is working today.

□ 1445

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for working in a bipartisan manner, and subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO, to make sure this bill got through on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that two policy changes that I led the fight for have been included in this legislation. Flooding disproportionately impacts low-economic communities and people of color.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago, a severe storm in my district flooded the streets of Compton and shut down parts of the 710 freeway. Many communities lack the money to pay for studies to plan and develop projects that can reduce damage from flooding and storms. As part of a new program funded by this bill, the Federal Government will now cover 100 percent of the cost of these studies for a select number of disadvantaged communities.

This bill also makes it less costly for communities to restore nature in ways that will reduce the risk of flooding and help provide cleaner air and water.

For example, it will be easier to restore areas where water covers the soil, known as wetlands, such as the Dominguez Gap Wetlands along the Los Angeles River. Or we can more easily afford planting street trees and trees in local parks to absorb flood water, cool the community, and clean the air.

In short, this bill will make our communities stronger, built to last, and better prepared for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I appreciate the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure bringing us a strong bipartisan product, of which you have heard. This meets the water management needs across our country.

The Third District of Nebraska was heavily impacted by unprecedented

flooding last year. These floods ravaged farmland, destroyed essential infrastructure, like highways, water treatment plants, and levees that had withstood the test of time for decades. The Army Corps of Engineers has worked within their authority to address these water management issues around our State; however, they have not been able to address every concern.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member working with me to ensure inactive levees have an opportunity to receive assistance from the Army Corps of Engineers if they meet certain criteria. Peru, Nebraska, is one of the many communities that could be helped by this legislative language.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES and their staff for the wonderful work that they did for putting this bipartisan bill together, and also Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 14 years, I have been working in Congress to advocate for the full authorized funding of Laredo, Texas’ Chacon Creek Restoration Project.

The Army Corps now, once we get this done, can carry out the flood risk management and ecosystem project totaling about \$52 million. The flood mitigation component will evacuate 250 homes from the floodplain, from Lake Casa Blanca all the way down to the Rio Grande along the Chacon Creek.

This ecosystem restoration component will also include 417 acres of wetland and riparian restoration. This is a natural treasure that we have in Laredo, Texas, and it will provide hundreds of acres of new recreational and educational parklands.

Mr. Speaker, the Chacon Creek is a tremendous natural resource in Laredo, and I thank the ranking member and committee staff for doing this great work.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES and Chairman DEFAZIO.

Mr. Speaker, Southeast Texas is the global leader in creating reliable, affordable energy that powers America and, quite frankly, much of the world. But we can’t do that without modernizing and improving our water infrastructure, which it is my honor to have achieved in this bill for the people of the 36th Congressional District of Texas, and by extension, all American families.

My district has four ports, including the main port terminal of the Port of Houston. The Houston Ship Channel is the busiest U.S. deep-draft waterway, and it is the top exporting port in the Nation.

This bill turns years of advocacy to dredge, widen, and improve two-way traffic on the Houston Ship Channel into real results. This will allow for a more efficient, safe, and productive waterway for all. But I also recognize that there is still much work to be done. It is not an exaggeration to say that by spending \$1 million today on hurricane and flood prevention infrastructure, we can save a billion dollars in damages down the road from another storm like Hurricane Harvey, which dumped 60 inches of rain on my district—a North American rainfall record, by the way.

Thankfully, this bill contains numerous provisions for me and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that work to address these critical needs. It is a great honor to serve the people of Southeast Texas in Congress in producing legislation like this bipartisanly—one of the biggest reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the bipartisan work of the chairman, the ranking member, and also the staff and the subcommittee chair.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in Washington State, we are blessed with an abundance of rivers and lakes that support fish and wildlife. Right now, projects like modifying tide gates and restoring or reconnecting floodplains and wetlands are not getting the priority they need to protect these important ecosystems.

I am so pleased that the bill I introduced with Congressman RICK LARSEN was included in WRDA. By prioritizing rivers with the greatest chance of recovery, we have the best shot at protecting these waterways and achieving the largest return on our investments.

Healthy rivers mean clean water for fish, wildlife, and communities, and healthy salmon runs help us meet our treaty rights obligations, ensure thriving local economies and recreational opportunities, and protect our endangered salmon and orca populations.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year’s bipartisan Water Resources Development Act.

Our country was built on an elaborate system of inland waterways, ports, and harbors to facilitate trade and transportation. And nearly every community in our country relies on open waterways to move their products.

My district is no exception. We are home to the Port of Huntington Tri-State on the Ohio River. This interconnected water system creates jobs and ensures that Appalachia remains a competitive region of economic growth.

As we rethink and reform America's supply chains post-COVID, we must continue to open, update, and modernize key water infrastructure to maintain safety and efficiency. WRDA investments secure this mission.

WRDA also delivers protection from hurricanes and flooding. In my district in southern West Virginia, we saw disaster strike in 2016 when our dams overflowed, and our rivers tore through many vibrant communities. As we recover and rebuild, we must also prepare for the future.

If we pass this bill, we can double the funding for flood protection in central West Virginia and triple the funding in southern West Virginia. The vast majority of American communities lie along key U.S. waterways. And while I work for my district, countless others will also see increased protections.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country, I implore my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2020 Water Resources Development Act, a bill that includes language that I fought for to ensure that the Federal Government not just supports and funds flood control projects, but also supports those projects in economically disadvantaged communities.

For too long, the Army Corps has relied on an outdated metric when making decisions whether or not to invest. Unfortunately, it is a metric that doesn't always capture the project's full value, including the potential loss of valuable agricultural land, like that in the Pajaro Valley in my district on the central coast of California.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, though, with continued pressure by me and many other stakeholders, I am proud that the 2020 WRDA contains language that directs the Army Corps when they re-scope projects to take into account non-Federal interests, especially in economically disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on WRDA, and I look forward to working with them to reach a final compromise with the Senate that maintains this language to properly invest in all communities, not just to save money, but to save lives.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for including my request to fund Section 531, the program for Southern and Eastern Kentucky.

In the region that I serve, we are still fighting for clean water and reliable wastewater systems for our families, our schools, and our businesses. Many of our folks, like those in Martin Coun-

ty, are often forced to boil water because lines are failing, and believe it or not, we are still finding straight pipes dumping raw sewage into some of our beautiful streams.

Thanks to Section 531, some 35,000 families in Southern and Eastern Kentucky now have their own septic system or access to a reliable wastewater system, and over 90 percent of my rural region now has access to clean water.

But it should be 100 percent in every part of America. Anything less is shameful. And that is why this funding increase and this bill are so critical.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. GRAVES, and Chairman DEFAZIO for bringing a great bill out, and I urge its support.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for answering the plea of so many of us in relation to our districts. I thank subcommittee chairwoman, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member WESTERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad for all these years I have been working on issues dealing collectively with our Houston port or bayous and the flooding crisis that we have in Houston, Texas, Harris County.

I am glad that this legislation authorizes the Houston Ship Channel Expansion Improvement Project, part of my district, the Federal contribution to which is approximately \$463 million. I remember standing at the edge of our port looking at the mud collecting and impeding the going and coming of those vessels.

It authorizes the construction of all 34 pending Corps Chief's Reports received since the enactment of WRDA;

Authorizes 35 feasibility studies for water resources development projects;

And directs the Corps, which we have worked with, to expedite the completion of 41 feasibility studies currently underway, including the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment, Flood Risk Management feasibility study, which I have introduced over and over again. It is now going to move.

It fully unlocks the approximately \$10 billion currently held in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

It helps bayous in my district, Greens Bayou, White Oak Bayou, Hunting Bayou; and, of course, it recognizes that Hurricane Harvey—we had 21 trillion gallons of water, losing housing, 203,000 homes were damaged and 12,700 were destroyed.

Finally, what is so important, the bill directs the secretary to issue final agency procedures for its Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines to ensure that future water resources development projects will maximize sustainable development and affordably address the needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

The bill authorizes the Corps to study, design, and construct water resources.

Mr. Speaker, the most disadvantaged persons are the ones that suffer the most. I am grateful for this bill, and I ask support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act for 2020, which strengthens America's competitive edge by investing in our ports, harbors and inland waterways, builds more resilient communities, and creates additional flexibility for the Corps to address the water resources needs of economically disadvantaged communities, communities of color, and rural communities.

I thank Congressman DEFAZIO and Congressman GRAVES of Missouri, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO and Congressman WESTERMAN, the Water Development Resources Subcommittee Chair and Ranking Member, respectively, for their work in shepherding this important bipartisan legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan legislation because it:

1. Authorizes the Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, the federal contribution to which is approximately \$463 million.

2. Authorizes the construction of all 34 pending Corps Chief's Reports received since the enactment of WRDA 2018.

3. Authorizes 35 feasibility studies for water resources development projects, those identified through the public review process established by section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

4. Directs the Corps to expedite the completion of 41 feasibility studies currently underway, including the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study, which is certainly needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

5. Fully unlocks the approximately \$10 billion currently held in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) by providing the authority to appropriate additional funds for harbor maintenance needs from the existing balance in the Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, these water development projects managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in consultation with local partners are key to preserving our Nation's economy, to protecting our communities, and to maintaining our quality of life.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working with the Harris County Flood Control District since 1937 to reduce the risk of flooding within Harris County.

Current projects include 6 federal flood risk management projects:

1. Sims Bayou;
2. Greens Bayou;
3. Brays Bayou;
4. White Oak Bayou;
5. Hunting Bayou; and
6. Clear Creek.

In addition to these ongoing projects, the Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Addicks and Barker (A&B) Detention Dams in northwest Harris County.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation because it is essential in minimizing the risk of flood damage to Houston and Harris

County metropolitan area, the nation's fourth largest, is a matter of national significance because the region is one of the Nation's major technology, energy, finance, export and medical centers:

1. The Port of Houston is the largest bulk port in the world;

2. Texas Medical Center is a world renowned teaching, research and treatment center;

3. Houston is home to the largest conglomeration of foreign bank representation and second only to New York City as home to the most Fortune 500 companies; and

4. The Houston Watershed Assessment study area sits within major Hurricane Evacuation arteries for the larger Galveston Gulf Coast region.

At its peak on September 1, 2017, one-third of Houston was underwater due to Hurricane Harvey flooding.

There were over 41,500 square miles of land mass impacted by Hurricane Harvey and the subsequent flooding that covered an area larger than the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont combined.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

In September 2017, NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory reported that Hurricane Harvey's rainfall created 275 trillion pounds of water, which caused the crust in and around Houston to deform and sink nearly 1 inch because of the weight.

Over 300,000 structures flooded in southeastern Texas, where extreme rainfall hit many areas that are densely populated.

Hurricane Harvey is the largest housing disaster to strike the U.S. in our Nation's history.

Hurricane Harvey damaged 203,000 homes, of which 12,700 were destroyed.

Texas flood control districts are still struggling to recover from this record breaking flood event.

Nineteen trillion gallons of flood waters poured into the Houston Ship Channel from area rivers and bayous on the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

As a consequence, tens of millions of tons of sediment and debris flowed through the big-gest waterway in the nation.

The Port of Houston produces 27 percent of the nation's gasoline and about 60 percent of the U.S. aviation fuel.

Investments in all aspects of our Nation's water infrastructure pays dividends in the form of economic activity.

The Houston Ship Channel generates \$617 billion in the U.S. with \$265 billion of that in Texas representing 16 percent of the state of Texas's GDP.

The Port of Houston sustains 2.7 million jobs nationally with 1.2 million of them within the state of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, let me list a few of the provisions in this bill that will benefit my communities I represent.

The bill directs the Secretary to issue final agency procedures for its Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines (PR&G) to ensure that future water resources development projects will maximize sustainable development and affordably address the needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

The bill authorizes the Corps to study, design and construct water resources projects

for communities that have been subjected to repetitive flooding events and have received emergency flood assistance, including construction of temporary barriers.

This authority will help repetitive loss communities, especially those in economically-disadvantaged communities, obtain critical flood protection.

The legislation requires the Corps to undertake an inventory of water resources development projects and associated properties that are or may be contaminated with PFAS, and to develop a plan to remediate and limit potential human exposure to the contamination.

The bill requires the Corps to complete its review on minority community and tribal consultation, as well as update Corps' policies on environmental justice considerations and community engagement and consultation.

Finally, the legislation authorizes and creates additional flexibility for the Corps to address the water resources needs of economically disadvantaged communities, communities of color, and rural communities, such as authorizing the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance for resiliency planning, with priority given to economically disadvantaged communities.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 7575, the bipartisan Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

□ 1500

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the First Congressional District of New York, located on the East End of Long Island, a district almost completely surrounded by water. We were hit really hard by Superstorm Sandy, and the widespread devastation emphasized the dire need to ensure our communities were better prepared for the future.

Working hard with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Colonel Thomas Asbery of the Army Corps, and their entire hardworking team, this bill prioritizes local projects that are vital to my congressional district.

That includes the Fire Island to Montauk Point project, which includes essential dredging and shoreline projects over 83 miles of coastline.

Coastal storm risk management for Hashamomuck Cove in Southold is included, where right now local residents, businesses, and first responders are paralyzed even during a severe thunderstorm.

Equally as important, this legislation continues to build on these victories, jump-starting movement on projects at Reel Point Reserve and Shelter Island, Goldsmith's Inlet in Southold, and Wading River Creek in Riverhead through authorizing feasibility studies.

The Water Resources Development Act is great news for our shorelines on

Long Island and across the country, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for the opportunity to briefly speak on the bipartisan 2020 Water Resources Development Act.

I am pleased that this bill includes my legislation, the Tuscarawas River Flooding Study Act, which authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a comprehensive feasibility study on the Tuscarawas River watershed.

Northeast Ohio is justifiably proud of our historical heritage regarding the Ohio and Erie Canal. From the Portage Lakes to Canal Fulton, this heritage is embedded throughout my district. However, this legacy also means that cities and villages often encounter recurring flooding events because of the historical building patterns from the 19th century.

Just last summer, southwest Summit County saw significant flooding throughout the Tuscarawas River basin. This study will serve as a first step toward beginning to find solutions to address these challenges.

I would like to thank the Huntington District of the Army Corps for their extensive work with my office on this issue and Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District for their knowledge and guidance.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue in my district that I have been working tirelessly on, and that is to preserve the pool at the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam.

I am extremely disappointed this legislation was brought before the House with no opportunity to amend the bill before negotiations began with the Senate.

The lock and dam, and the pool it creates, is critical to the Augusta community and is utilized for municipal and industrial water supply as well as recreation.

The Corps of Engineers recently selected a rock weir as an alternative to replace the lock and dam, a design that drops the pool level and was demonstrated last year with disastrous results. Not only does this plan not meet the requirements of the WIIN Act, but local stakeholders have expressed serious concerns with the Corps of Engineers' proposal. This option does not meet the intent of Congress and maintain the pool.

Moving forward with the rock weir is unacceptable, and I thank my colleagues from Georgia for their bipartisan effort to champion this issue in the recent committee markup.

I urge the committee to work with me to include language in the final bill that will repair and maintain the lock and dam and the pool, while still accommodating the mitigation project. It is essential.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), who understands water issues.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill that includes language for flood control in Puerto Rico. We are now in the hurricane season, and today, it is announced a tropical storm between today and tomorrow.

The flood control projects included in the bill are Río Guayanilla, Río Manatí in Ciales, and Río Culebrinas on the northwestern part of the island, as well as important provisions to study flood damage, provide resiliency planning assistance, and evaluate seismic risks.

I am also most proud to have secured in this bill an increase to the authorization cost for the Cano Martín Peña project, \$232.4 million, as established during the feasibility phase in 2016, fixing a discrepancy in WRDA 2007. This increase ensures updated costs are considered as the project moves forward, which is especially critical for the development of eight communities in the San Juan area.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, WRDA 2020 is a good bipartisan piece of legislation that is going to improve flood control infrastructure and improve ports, harbors, and inland waterways across the country.

This is infrastructure that is critical to protecting our communities and our farms and businesses in north Missouri and the rest of America. It is essential to the efficient movement of goods, products, commodities, and resources nationwide.

Again, I want to thank the many cosponsors and the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work on this very important bill.

Also, committee staff on both sides put a lot of work into this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank them all for their hard work. Specifically, from the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, the Republican staff, I want to thank Ian Bennitt, Jon Pawlow, and Victor Sarmiento. From the Democrat staff, I want to thank Ryan Seiger, Navis Bermudez, Camille Touton, and Alexa Williams. From the Republican full committee staff, I want to thank Paul

Sass, Jack Ruddy, Corey Cooke, Tara Hupman, Abby Camp, Nick Christensen, Justin Harclerode, Tyler Micheletti, Jamie Hopkins, and Shawn Bloch. In addition, I very much want to thank Kathy Dedrick, Mohsin Syed, and the rest of the Democrat full committee staff.

WRDA is a perfect example of Republicans and Democrats working together to address America's infrastructure needs, as this committee is meant to do, I would urge all Members to support this legislation.

I want to add, too, Mr. Speaker, the gracious work of and being able to work with Chairman DEFAZIO. When we work together, it actually works quite well, and I want to thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. We find many opportunities to work together. There are times when we have significant policy differences, and we get through it. And we will keep plugging.

This bill is great for our Nation. On a daily basis, of our Nation's 58 largest ports, they only have about 40 percent of their capability due to deferred dredging.

We have jetties failing around the Nation. We heard from CONOR LAMB from Pennsylvania. We did great engineering work in the 1800s and early 1900s. I viewed a lock in his district built in the early 1900s, but these things do have a lifetime.

The increase in cost share for inland waterways is going to make a great difference. We are finally going to spend the \$10 billion that the American people have put into an account for harbor maintenance on harbor maintenance. Things take a long time in Washington, D.C. I started on that with Bud Shuster in 1996, but finally, we are going to get there.

This money can and will be very productively spent. It will put people to work, and it will make our Nation more competitive.

We had, for quite some time, a dispute among the various ports, large, small, and in between. We worked all of that out. It is easier to do when there is more money. So, this bill is going to be good for large, medium, and small ports, and emerging harbors. And just to be parochial, it is going to be great for my district.

We have many, many dangerous bar entrances. Fishers, particularly commercial, sometimes recreational, die there. The dredging needs are always going to be there. Also, we have failing jetties that need replacement, so the additional cost share there will help.

Then an additional cost share by statute for the Great Lakes, although I did talk with Ms. KAPTUR, and she feels that we didn't quite get it right. We will work on that in conference.

I would like to thank staff: Ryan Seiger, who is chief counsel on the sub-

committee; Camille Touton; Alexa Williams; Navis Bermudez; Joe Sheehy, who works for GRACE NAPOLITANO, who couldn't be here today; and legislative counsel Kakuti Lin. Legislative counsel has been fabulous. Then, the other side of the aisle: Ian Bennitt, Victor Sarmiento, Jon Pawlow. Again, thanks to my friend and colleague, the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act for 2020. This legislation is the result of bipartisan work and leadership of Committee Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES and many others. It deserves to be passed by the this House as a vital contribution to improving and maintaining our Nation's ports system, inland waterways, dams, levees, aids to navigation, flood control, and the many critical support and operational functions of our U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in support of national, state and local water resources development needs.

Alaska's 33,904 miles of shoreline dwarf the Lower 48 and with fewer miles of paved road than Rhode Island, Alaska's rivers are our highways and our ports are the lifeblood of our state's communities. The Committee continues to make incremental progress on embracing the unique challenges Alaskan communities face with respect to port and harbor improvements, inland waterway navigation, flood and storm protection and other water resource infrastructure overseen by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Army Corps Alaska District is an integral partner to Alaska's communities managing significant project demand with limited resources. However, need continues to outpace available appropriations and Corps resources to get projects completed. The reforms to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund included in this bill is a step in the right direction and I will continue to advocate for greater federal investment for our nation's water infrastructure.

I am particularly pleased that WRDA 2020 contains an authorization for improvements to the Port of Nome, Alaska as well as other provisions for ports and harbors in Alaska. It is rewarding to see that a majority of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in this House and in the other body, have come to recognize, along with the Administration, the essential and indispensable strategic, national defense and commercial importance of the Arctic for our Nation's future.

The authorization of \$490,919,000 for the Arctic Deep Draft Port project in Nome included in this bill has been a long time coming, and it is a positive step forward for Alaska and the country. The Port of Nome, due to its geographic location, is a strategic transportation hub that meets the needs of U.S. Arctic Policy by strengthening U.S. presence in the region. The Port of Nome expansion is critical to ensure more effective search and rescue and environmental response activities as vessel traffic increases throughout the Arctic. The port will serve the country's National interests and support Coast Guard and Navy operations. It will also expand an existing logistics

hub for more than 50 Alaskan coastal communities to help reduce the cost of living and create economic opportunity throughout Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

I want to commend the Army Corp's Alaska District, General Semonite and Assistant Secretary James for all their hard work to get the Chiefs report done in time for this bill. As a former tugboat captain in Alaska, I know how important it is to have good ports, and I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for including this provision in the bill.

The bill also provides for the authorization of two other much needed projects to benefit Alaskan harbors. The bill authorizes a \$34,937,000 dredging project for Unalaska Dutch Harbor. Dutch Harbor is one of the nation's top fishing ports measured by catch volume and value and is essential to the Alaska fishing economy and the nation's food supply. The project will dredge the entrance channel of the harbor to 58 feet improving the ability of commercial, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Navy, U.S. military assets and ships from allied nations to utilize the harbor.

The bill also includes language to include the authorization for St. George's navigation improvements project pending the timely release of a positive Chiefs Report from the Army Corps. The project will provide for the operability, safety and reliability of the St. George Harbor as promised by the federal government to aid the transition of the economy of the Pribilof Islands away from fur seals to commercial fishing.

Importantly, the bill makes an improvement to the Tribal Partnership Program by increasing the per project federal cost share cap to \$15 million dollars from \$12.5 million. This improvement is a step in the right direction and the increase begins to take into account the challenges Alaska faces with higher project costs. In forthcoming WRDA bills, I will continue to work with my colleagues and the Committee to ensure that Corps policies regarding benefit-cost ratios, existing authorities and cost share requirements treat Alaska fairly and take into account all the unique environmental challenges present in Alaska.

As this bill moves into the Conference process, I will continue working with my colleagues to include language, present in the Senate's draft bill, that will protect nonfederal project sponsors from shouldering cost liabilities incurred by the Army Corps through no fault of their own. This language is needed for Project Cooperation Agreement in instances where the Army Corps has been assessed a large adverse judgment by the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals or another court of competent jurisdiction.

In December 2018, the Aleutians East Borough was notified by the Army Corps that the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals had awarded Kelly-Ryan, Inc. a \$20,000,000 judgement for a procurement dispute arising in 2006–09 over the construction of a breakwater and other general navigation features in False Pass, Alaska. The standard Project Cooperation Agreement between a non-federal project sponsor and the Corps for any Civil Works project sets out the specific cost-sharing requirements applicable to the project. The Agreement includes a definition of "total costs of construction of the general navigation features". This definition includes "the Government's costs of contract dispute settlements or awards". The costs of disputes, claims, and

equitable adjustments are added to the final cost of a project and allocated between the non-federal and USACE based on the cost-share formula.

The Army Corps has verbally informed the Borough that 20 percent of this judgement (\$4 million) may be allocated to the Borough's financial share of the project in the future. Notably, the dispute had nothing to do with the project's design, engineering, or construction. The dispute was instead focused on the manner in which the USACE's contracting officer sought to comply with a congressional directive changing the manner in which the Corps funded continuing contracts. Non-federal sponsors, especially smaller rural communities, should not be required to carry a significant share of the financial burden when there is a violation of procurement law peripheral to the actual design, engineering, and construction of the project itself.

As many know one of my mottos is "Alaska to the future." Looking ahead, as the only "Arctic State" in the Union, Alaska will play the central role in hosting future arctic infrastructure including as "System of Ports" and safe harbors as national security, government and commercial activities inevitably increase in and around the Arctic in the coming years. The Army Corp's Alaska Deep-Draft Arctic Port System Study and recent Defense Department and U.S. Coast Guard strategic studies have shown that, U.S. strategic interests will benefit from increased arctic infrastructure including port infrastructure to cover Alaska's vast arctic land mass.

What is needed, and what has been called for, is a "System of U.S. Arctic Ports" whereby the improvements at Nome should be the first in a series of needed improvements at other key Alaska locations that will provide the United States with the breadth of assets including a specialized Ports System for coverage and access to the Arctic.

One location that should warrant due consideration for future improvements in an Arctic Ports System is Port Clarence/Point Spencer located immediately adjacent to the Bering Strait. Today's U.S. year-round ice free "Arctic" ports are in Dutch Harbor, Adak, and St. Paul, Alaska which play important roles because of their locations. As ice navigability improves the natural and protected deep-water port of Port Clarence can serve as a year-round potential forward service center and port of refuge close to, and directly adjacent to the key "choke point" of the Bering Strait.

The following is a brief overview of key information about this strategically located natural deep-water port in the Arctic:

Port Clarence is north-northwest of Nome (70 miles), on the Seward Peninsula, and is a protected natural deep-water harbor. It is sheltered by a long isthmus called Point Spencer. Most recently, the U.S. Coast Guard based a LORAN facility at Point Spencer with associated power and an 8,000-foot airstrip (4,500 feet of paved runway and 3,500 feet of extended gravel-covered runway).

Port Clarence's protected harbor served Indigenous people of the region before contact with European cultures.

Port Clarence served as a port of refuge for whaling vessels in the mid-1850s while Alaska was under Russian sovereignty. It still serves as the Port of Refuge from storms for vessels, including U.S. Coast Guard vessels and other government and commercial vessels travelling

through the Bering Strait or docked temporarily in Nome.

From 1866 to 1867, Port Clarence served as the forward operating base for the Western Union Telegraph Expedition in the attempt to link the continents with an undersea telegraph cable.

Around 1884 it became the central summer refitting port for the Arctic fleet, which usually arrived in July and headed south around September (unless they elected to overwinter there).

The Port of Nome project and potential development Port Clarence/Point Spencer is positioned to become a key part of America's deep-water Arctic Ports System, ready to receive and assist vessels moving to and from Arctic destinations, trans-Arctic shipping, or Navy and Coast Guard vessels and aircraft undertaking a wide variety of missions from those dealing with national security to economic development, search and rescue, shipping safety, oil spill prevention, response and clean up, arctic research, maritime law enforcement on the Bering Sea, the Chukchi Sea, and the Arctic Ocean.

The Congress authorized the transfer of certain tracts of land at Point Spencer to Bering Straits Native Corporation (BSNC) while providing the opportunity for retention of certain tracts by the USCG and the State of Alaska should the USCG and the State wish to retain those tracts. Port development at Point Spencer-Port Clarence should proceed as a cooperative effort among the State, the Federal government, and BSNC in coordination with the enhancements of the Port of Nome.

Port Clarence has, historically been and will continue to be a valuable "Port of Refuge" because of its naturally deep waters and naturally protected harbor—as shipping vessel traffic continues to increase in the Arctic.

BSNC is working now with U.S. Corps of Engineers to place 30-ton and 60-ton industrial grade mooring system buoys at Port Clarence to serve maritime safety needs for the entire Bering Strait Region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for their leadership in this unusually challenging time in the Congress and for our nation by bringing this bipartisan Water Resources Development Act legislation to the House Floor. I look forward to the positive impact that WRDA 2020 will have on our nation's water resources development for decades to come.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support of the Water Resources Development Act. This strong, bipartisan bill will help assure that our nation's ports, harbors, and waterways are developed and maintained to enhance economic and environmental vitality.

I am particularly pleased with the commitment to beneficial reuse of dredged material from Corps water resources projects. Dredged material is a valuable resource that can help restore impacted shorelines and ecosystems and that can create resilient coastlines and estuaries. Environmental groups in California have emphasized the importance of beneficial reuse, specifically because the dredged material can play a vital role in restoring and preserving shallow water habitats such as tidal marshes and mudflats. The beneficial use pilot program, first authorized in WRDA 2016, was so successful that H.R. 7575 increases the

number of eligible projects. Notably, our own San Francisco Bay estuary faces a number of issues associated with resiliency and sustainability, and the reuse of dredged material can be enormously helpful in addressing these critical issues around the Bay. In its report for WRDA 2020, the Committee highlighted Richmond Outer Harbor, Pinole Shoal, and the San Francisco Bay as priorities for consideration in the next round of pilot projects.

This year's bill also highlights the role and value of alternative dredging methods and equipment to beneficial reuse of dredged material. Specifically, I am encouraged that the Committee clarifies that the use of alternative dredging methods and equipment must be part of the overall beneficial use program. This is important as, too often, we find that the old ways utilized by the Corps for maintaining navigation channels will not meet modern day demands to protect our natural resources and build a resilient future through reliable strategic management plans that allow annual dredging.

This bill will go a long way toward improving our environment, providing much-needed direction to the Army Corps, and supporting California's 11th District.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I would like to thank Chairman DeFazio and my fellow colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their diligent work to produce this much needed water resources bill. Everyone in the U.S. is impacted by the need for clean water and I believe this bill takes a giant step forward to ensuring this becomes a reality for every American.

Within my district, The City of Dallas is appreciative to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for their funding of the Dallas Floodway, Dallas Floodway Extension flood risk management projects and Lewisville Dam repairs and their continued efforts to complete these projects quickly. I look forward to continuing to hear good reports on the progress of these projects. I am pleased that the Corps is moving forward with these projects.

Please allow me to note that it is helpful for the Corps to accept input from non-federal sponsors in the development of WRDA guidance. The Corps, working with local non-federal sponsors instead of developing guidance independently, will result in more resilient projects with multiple benefits. The role of resiliency in the construction, operation and maintenance of projects carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) must continue to be a priority.

The Dallas area falls within the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers. Flooding and flood control continue to be issues that are ever-present on the minds of residents along the Trinity River. I have held several meetings on flooding in the Dallas area to address this issue and hope to continue to work with the Corps to combat flooding in Dallas.

Other parts of North Texas have also benefited from projects included in previous versions of WRDA legislation. The projects addressing pump stations and levy heights in Dallas, along with bridge projects in Ft. Worth would not be where they are today without the Corps and this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex is growing at a quite rapid pace and

this updated legislation will help to provide adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to meet the demands, given the rapid pace of growth and development in our area. Furthermore, the bill will help in addressing maintenance needs, replacing aging infrastructure, and help in accounting for human behavior in all aspects of our water system—from sewer overflows, to promoting water conservation through drought tolerant outdoor landscaping.

Lastly, I want to thank the committee for working with me to include language in the bill regarding the embankment of Lake Waco, on which Lake Shore Drive is located, so that we may keep the public safe from danger. I understand that there is also language in the Senate bill on the Lakeshore Drive issue that may be more direct. As we move through completion of this bill in conference, I hope to continue to work with the committee to ensure that Lakeshore Drive is not a safety hazard.

Mr. Speaker, the projects I just mentioned are a tiny piece of the multitude of projects the Army Corps of Engineers works on to help address the water needs of the United States and its residents. Every American is impacted by this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFALZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7575, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1523

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY) at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7617, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1067) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—230

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hastings	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Pressley
Brindisi	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Case	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Cohen	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Shalala
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sires
Crist	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Crow	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cunningham	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Loebach	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stevens
Dean	Lowe	Suozzi
DeFazio	Lujan	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Luria	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Malinowski	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Maloney	Titus
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Deutch	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McAdams	Torres Small
Doggett	McBath	(NM)
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Trahan
Engel	McEachin	Trone
Escobar	McGovern	Underwood
Eshoo	McNerney	Vargas
Español	Meeks	Veasey
Evans	Meng	Vela
Finkenauer	Mfume	Velázquez
Fletcher	Moore	Vislosky
Foster	Morelle	Wasserman
Frankel	Moulton	Schultz
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Golden	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O'Halleran	
	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—181

Aderholt	Bergman	Bucshon
Allen	Biggs	Budd
Amash	Bilirakis	Burchett
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Burgess
Armstrong	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Babin	Bost	Calvert
Bacon	Brady	Carter (GA)
Baird	Brooks (AL)	Carter (TX)
Balderson	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Banks	Buchanan	Cheney
Barr	Buck	Cline